THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

FOURTH SERIES.—VOL. VII.—(XXXVII).—OCTOBER, 1907.—No. 4.

A CATHOLIC BIBLE SOCIETY: PROTESTANT EFFORTS AND A CATHOLIC ATTEMPT.

AT the commencement of the year 1813 a number of Protestant gentlemen joined themselves into a society the object of which was the circulation of the Rheims version of the Scriptures among Catholics of the poorer classes. They established a fund, called by them the Catholic Fund, which, supplied by the donations of liberal Protestants, was to pay for "printing the Rhemish version of the New Testament and the dispersing it gratuitously, or at a low price, among the Roman Catholics in the United Kingdom." It was thought that educated Catholics themselves, far from objecting to the scheme, would welcome it, and that, moreover, having found such generous benefactors among Protestants as to obtain their own translation of the Bible without expense, they would be content to sacrifice the notes and comments with which, in some sort or other, the Douay and Rheims Scriptures had, from their first appearance, been accompanied. A prospectus issued 12 January, 1813, brought the matter to the knowledge of those thought to be sympathetic: "It is now proposed to reprint, most faithfully and correctly, their own Rhemish translation, without note, comment, or addition." The sum required and asked for starting the work was £500.

It must be confessed that the members of the Catholic body to whom this prospectus was sent were placed by it in a somewhat awkward position. Had they only to reply to it

from the point of view of their poverty, which was given forth as one of the reasons for such large-hearted generosity on the part of Protestants, they might, in case the proposal was not an acceptable one, have politely declined the proffered assistance. They might have said, "It is true, we are poor; it is true, also, that Bibles are not very plentiful among the members of our Faith; but, only in case of the greatest necessity could we allow a religion which has been the cause of our poverty to bestow on us any kind of bounty. That necessity does not really exist. The reading of the Sacred Scriptures we have never held to be a *sine qua non* of salvation. The sublime truths which are to be found in those inspired pages are carefully taught to our people in other, and even better, ways than by their own personal reading. Were this not the case, or were it a fact that the people ask for bread and receive a stone, we might consider if the natural pride, which sits so well on such poverty as ours, might not be now cast aside, and your proposal meet with a ready acceptance."

Partly because of the peculiar circumstances of their unhappy position and partly because a small community, such as the members of the Catholic Church in England then formed, must always suffer from some who may be very wise but who are not very prudent, the Catholics had themselves made it impossible to answer the Protestant proposal quite so easily. Some of them, possibly in the heat of controversy, had allowed certain extravagant expressions to fall from their lips. Not only had they properly insisted that it was false to represent them as either afraid of, or as unfriendly toward, the Word of God; not only had stress been laid upon the fact that it was the Catholics who had protected and preserved the Scriptures in times long previous to the great change in religion of the sixteenth century, and that, from the days when the Rheims edition had been first of all set forth, either completely new translations had been attempted by priests or improvements on the Douay had been made by bishops; not only had they said this, but they had more than once asserted that, far from objecting to indiscriminate Bible reading, they wel-

comed it, and would distribute copies themselves, provided they were not the Authorized Protestant version. The words of the Rev. Peter Gandolphy, a priest, must have appeared to non-Catholics very similar to a challenge. He said: "If any of the Bible Societies feel disposed to try our esteem for the Bible by presenting us with some copies of a Catholic version, with or without notes, we will gratefully accept and faithfully distribute them." This had been written the year before the Catholic Fund, as it was called, was started, and we can hardly blame its Protestant secretary for supposing that the Rev. Peter Gandolphy might be a suitable person for acquainting the Catholic authorities with the extent of the interest taken by outsiders in the Scriptural enlightenment of their people. The Protestant organization hoped, so the secretary wrote to the priest, "to be informed that the plan proposed would meet with the full approbation of the Roman Catholic clergy in general."

The Catholics now saw themselves almost forced to do something. They must either accept the proposal, and, by so doing, surrender one of the positions which, since the Reformation, they and their Fathers had stoutly maintained, namely, that the Bible in the vulgar tongue without notes would, in the hands of the people, be productive of as much evil as, if not more evil than, good; and they could hardly relinquish this principle without rendering their Catholicity at least suspect. Or, again, they must decline to have anything to do with the organization and its object; and this would lead the English people to conclude that, after all, it was not poverty on the one hand nor the errors of the Authorized version on the other, but real antagonism to Bible reading which was answerable for the scarcity of copies of the Scripture among Catholics. And just at this time, when the country was becoming more and more convinced of the justice of Catholic claims to complete emancipation, it was exasperating even to be supposed to excite apprehensions in the Protestant mind that a view which had already wrought untold mischief to Catholicism was not a calumny but a truth. Or, finally, there was yet

another course, and this was, boldly to take the whole matter upon themselves, and, with or without Protestant aid, set to work to provide the Scriptures as cheaply as possible for those who wanted them. It must be a Catholic Society. The thing must be done in a Catholic way. For they could not help seeing that even the Latin Vulgate, when translated and set forth by outsiders, would become quite as much a Protestant version as the Authorized, which was based upon ancient codices every whit as Catholic as either the old *Itala*, or St. Jerome's recension of that venerable translation. There was nothing for it, then, since they must show to the English world that their protestations concerning the Bible and its utility in the vulgar tongue had been seriously meant, but to found a Catholic Bible Society.

The venture was not altogether a new one, nor was it the last thing of its kind, in the Catholic Church. Early in the eighteenth century a society was established in Paris for bringing at least the New Testament within the reach of the poorest. About the year 1805 the ecclesiastical Seminary at Ratisbon prepared a cheap edition of the New Testament in German, and, in the space of ten years, had managed to dispose of sixty thousand copies. Hanover, Poland, Russia saw the rise of a similar kind of society between the years 1812 and 1816, the Catholic President of the organization in Hanover saying that, "he rejoiced in the opportunity of uniting in so glorious a cause," being "decidedly of opinion that the Scriptures should be put into the hands of every class of persons, and that even the poorest and meanest should have it in his power to draw divine instruction from the fountain head."

The Catholics of England had made up their minds to act for themselves. On 8 March, 1813, two months after the establishing of the Protestant Fund, the question came up for discussion among the members of the Catholic Board presided over by the Lord Clifford, and the result of the deliberations are set forth to the following effect: "The Board are of opinion that it is highly desirable to have a subscription entered into by the Roman Catholics of Great Britain for the purpose

of promoting a gratuitous distribution of the Holy Scriptures." The week following a committee was appointed, made up of one ecclesiastic, the Right Rev. Dr. Poynter, Vicar Apostolic of the London district, and six of the principal members of the Catholic laity. Finally, on 27 March the Society was formed "from among the Roman Catholics of Great Britain," and it was then settled that the name by which it should be known was to be "The Roman Catholic Bible Society." The Vicars Apostolic were asked to become patrons of the new venture, and it was to be worked by a President, twelve Vice-presidents, a Secretary, and a committee of twenty-five members.

That the Catholic Board considered they were launching a most important scheme, which they fervently hoped would extend its existence very far into the future, seems evident from the arrangements made in the matter of subscriptions. Subscribers of one guinea annually were to be regarded as members; ten guineas at any one time would make a life member; three guineas annually made a governor, and thirty guineas down a governor for life.

Difficulties beset the path of the new Society from its inception right on until, after a troubled existence of only some two years, it joined the ranks of lost causes. There was, to begin with, the Protestant organization already started. The Catholic Board did not see why, if the charitably disposed who were not of their own Faith should feel inclined to assist, such assistance should be bluntly refused; only, unfortunately, the charitably disposed members of the organization were ready with their help solely on condition that a Bible without notes should issue from the Catholic press. This matter of the notes formed, as it were, the rock on which, at the beginning, the New Bible Society ran aground, never afterwards getting free from it until quite a wreck. Disagreement was rife among the members of the Committee itself. The lay portion could see no reason for the retention of any kind of comment as an accompaniment of the sacred text, and they considered that Protestant assistance was very cheaply purchased by agreeing to observe the condition

suggested. The ecclesiastical element of the Committee were of a widely different opinion. Quite naturally, and altogether wisely, they made it at once apparent that the Society and they must part company if notes were not to be admitted into its productions. They considered that the state of religious parties in England and the rising wave of infidelity, only increased the need of Bible explanations, already most necessary for the reason alone that so much of that Book is obscure to the mind not conversant with Eastern tongues and history nor theologically trained. A compromise was arrived at between the divided committee. It was thought that neither Protestant prejudice nor Catholic loyalty might find any grounds for objection in the following decision: "all such notes as are offensive to the just feelings of our Christian brethren be omitted." The result of that decision was that no one was satisfied. The members of the Protestant organization were determined that anything short of a complete elimination of the notes would be regarded as "offensive to the just feelings" of themselves; and, consequently, the offer of help was cancelled. The organization would work by itself. It would see that the poor Catholic enjoyed what it considered to be the great boon of the Rheims edition without the Rheims notes. It was quite in earnest; and on 1 May, 1813, as well as passing a resolution that the matter should be taken in hand, it determined that its "Committee be especially instructed to enquire carefully into the extent to which the Irish poor are supplied with the Roman Catholic version of the Scriptures." The compromise had failed to satisfy the Protestants, and the sequel will show that it served only to exasperate the Catholics.

In the year 1815, two years after the formation of the Roman Catholic Bible Society, the first and only fruit of its labors was given to the public. This was a copy of the New Testament. The preliminary address, written by Dr. Poynter, President of the Society, consists of a short history of the Vulgate and of allusions to certain well-known facts, all tending to show that, far from neglecting, the Church has

been anxious in making both her clergy and laity familiar with the Scriptures. "In the course of theological studies," it says, "in Catholic universities, and colleges of ecclesiastical education, the Sacred Scriptures are well read and deeply explored. The Scriptures, together with the perpetual tradition of the Church, are the pure source from which the minister of Christ derives the knowledge of salvation which he is commissioned to impart to the people." The address refers also to the custom of reading the Epistle and Gospel every Sunday "in our Catholic chapels," and stress is laid upon the fact that the sermon was generally an explanation of the passage just read. "Surely," continues Dr. Poynter, "the Sacred Scriptures have not been neglected in the Roman Catholic Church, nor withheld from the Catholic public. Surely, Scriptural truth has been faithfully preserved and freely disseminated, by this most ancient and widely established Society."

Many causes combined to prevent the sale of this New Testament. The Bible Society, Catholic though it was, was regarded with suspicion by the majority of the members of the Faith. Its very name was not calculated to increase its chances of success with Catholics, to whom Bible Society meant Protestantism of the most militant and, perhaps, unscrupulous kind. Again, the Vicars Apostolic seemed very far from enthusiastic on the matter, and the great Vicar Apostolic of the day, Dr. Milner, charged dead against it. If some of the ecclesiastical authorities had accepted the invitation to become patrons of the Society, they had, he supposed, consented to do so for the purpose of keeping it in order. No such reason, nor indeed, any reason, would prevail on him to become in any way connected with the movement; and he warned his clergy against distributing the Scriptures among the unlettered members of his district. What, he asked, were the effects of Bible-reading observable at that time among Protestant peoples? "Never," he says, "were impiety and blasphemy so rife among people as at the present day; while the records of the courts of justice demonstrate that public crimes go on year by year, in proportion to the progress of the Bible

Societies, fourfold and even sixfold." In this assertion he was maintained by Dr. McHale, in 1825, who, when asked by the Commissioners inquiring into the state of Irish education, whether he believed the proposition, "crime seems to have multiplied in proportion to the ascendency of Bible Societies," answered, "I have no doubt of it: it is a matter susceptible of all the clearness of mathematical calculation . . . I believe that, if Bible Societies were to prevail in this country (Ireland) and to supplant the ancient religion, crime would multiply in the same extent."

It is difficult to see how any Catholic Bishop could have acted differently from Milner. It was the look of the thing to which, in the Roman Catholic Bible Society, he objected; and to him it looked very much as if a number of earnest Catholics had, at least by their action, accepted the principle laid down by Chillingworth and upheld by all Protestants, *The Bible and the Bible only is the sole Rule of Faith.* It was the fact of religious confusion, at that time making Christianity an object of scorn to the infidel, which impressed him; and it was as clear as the sun that that religious confusion had been introduced and increased by indiscriminate Bible reading. He spared no effort to bring to an end what he characterized as "that strange and unheard of institution in Church History, a Catholic Bible Society," and when this result had been obtained, he made merry, in the rough controversial manner of the day, over the fate which he felt sure would overtake even the printing type in which the Society's one publication had been set up: "The plates for continuing it (the New Testament) have been of late presented by an illustrious personage, into whose hands they had fallen, to one of our Prelates, who will undoubtedly employ the cartload of them for a good purpose, as they were intended to be, by disposing of them to some pewterer, who will convert them into culinary implements, gas light pipes, and other pipes."

Moreover, the Society had sacrificed the notes which had always accompanied the Rheims New Testament. It was useless to try and pacify the resentment of Catholics by say-

ing that, if a great many of the old comments and explanations had been omitted, still, a large number had been retained. Nothing particularly worth keeping, was the answer, had been kept, and all that might have been serviceable in the way of notes had been subjected to the pruning knife. And why was this? The predominating belief was that it was done to please Protestantism. "I am aware, Sir," writes an English Catholic pastor in the year 1817, "that there are Catholic lawyers in Lincoln's Inn, and other Catholics elsewhere, who wish to explode [*sic*] the Douay Bible and Rheims Testament, because Protestant Biblemongers hate them; and who, in compliment to the latter, have lately stereotyped and published an edition of the Testament full of blunders, in which every note of the former that was distasteful to the bigoted Protestants is carefully expunged: but I see with pleasure that this edition is despised and rejected by the Catholic public, and remains a dead weight on the hands of the publishers, who, themselves, are so far ashamed of their work that they suppress their own name."

There is now no one who does not approve of the opposition to which the Catholic Bible Society was subjected. Whether without notes, or with what Milner calls mutilated notes, a copy of the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue set forth by Catholics was bound to cause misunderstanding and, in a great many cases, something very much worse. Facts, nevertheless, show us that there was much to be said in excuse for the action of the Society. They were really right, after all, in their fears that a No-Popery cry and its consequent inconveniences may be produced by such small means as even a New Testament fortified with the annotations of the Rheims edition. For, in the same year (1813) as that in which the Bible Society was founded by "Catholic lawyers," the first parts of a Bible appeared in which all the Rhemish notes were given. It was issued under the patronage, and mainly by the efforts, of the Irish episcopate and two or three hundred of the clergy of that country. There is no reason to think that the undertaking was meant as a counter

blast or even as a protest against the work of the Bible Society, for it seems evident that the Irish Bishops had been contemplating a republication of the Douay Version for some years. Not till 1816 were all the parts printed and the edition completed, in which year it was set forth with the approbation of Dr. Troy, Catholic Archbishop of Dublin. Then the trouble began. Church dignitaries professed to be insulted by these so-called Popish comments on the Scriptures. The Protestant Church, it was represented, was in danger. The throne, it was alleged, was threatened. Newspaper after newspaper angrily wrote aginst Dr. Troy's annotated Bible. It was very evident, so they thought, from these notes, that the fires of Smithfield would soon again be lighted, if some one did not see to it. So great became the indignation of these literary gentlemen that they violently advocated, not a lessening of Catholic disabilities, but an increase of them, if the British Government did not wish to see the King and Country tied like slaves to the chariot wheels of the Pope. Dr. Troy and the Catholic Bishops of Ireland grew frightened. The episcopal approbation to the unfortunate Bible was withdrawn. The sale of it was stopped. The clergy were exhorted to prevent, in every way they could, the spread of the edition. There is, however, an amusing epilogue to the agitation against the Bible of 1816. It seems to have been withdrawn only to reappear in a still more formidable shape two years after, when it was presumed that Protestant politics would not think it worth while to create a No-Popery agitation. This time all the Rhemish notes were printed, together with a Catholic Ecclesiastical History, and, as if to fill up the cup, a book most objectionable to non-Catholics, Ward's *Errors of the Authorized Version,* was bound up with it. Strange to say, not the slightest opposition was aroused, so difficult is it to account for the genesis of a No-Popery agitation!

The Catholic Bible Society disappeared, regretted by only a very few members of the Church; although Dr. Milner was scarcely justified in his opinion that the type of the Society's

New Testament was on the point of being utilized for "culinary implements, gas pipes and other pipes." The type was used again in the year 1818 for what might be called the second edition of this publication, by Mr. Horrabin of the old Virginia Street Catholic Chapel in London. "While I was rejoicing," says Dr. Milner, " . . . at the fortunate exit of the stereotyped Testament, being resolved not to recall even the memory of it, I was alarmed with the notice, contained in a late printed report of the Education Committee, which announced that a Catholic Testament with Dr. Poynter's notes, was printed and upon sale, at the East end of the town, in six penny numbers."

Naturally, those who were so much against the first publication of this New Testament saw no reason why such opposition should be withheld from Mr. Horrabin's, which was the second. The objection arose from the same cause—the absence, or the mutilation, of the notes. "Judge whether," continued Dr. Milner, "from the state of the Catholic and the Protestant mind at the present day, there was, or is, sufficient cause for the unavailing sacrifices which have been made to the prejudices of the latter . . . It is plain that the cancelled part of our former Catholic notes is precisely the part which is wanted at the present day, as well as it was heretofore, to render an English translation of the sacred text profitable in the hands of the British laity."

It was indeed "the state of the Catholic and the Protestant mind" which rendered any such scheme as that put forth by the Catholic Board in the formation of its Bible Society quite futile. At no time since the Reformation could a Society similarly named, under like conditions, and professing the same object, hope for much success among Catholics. There is not, and there cannot be, the slightest objection to the Bible; but the words "Bible Society" have a Protestant sound, and stand for ideas which, if expressed, show much more plainly a desire to destroy the Catholic religion than they do a wish for a fair, impartial, and edifying reading of the Scriptures. We cannot conceive, even at the present day, of such a So-

ciety's being started without exciting the gravest suspicion among the members of the Church; although now there can be no fear that a Bible without notes would transform a Catholic into a Calvinist, or turn into a Puritan even the least enthusiastic adherent to the See of St. Peter. Our fears, if any, are caused by quite different dangers; but such dangers are not made less by presenting the Scriptures to the people without note or comment. In all sober truth, as notes and comments of a heterodox nature, so much so as to do away with the Divine element in the Bible altogether, are now, on all sides of us, bound up with the sacred text, it might well be considered whether quite a fresh series of notes, meeting the difficulties of the day, ought not to be published with our Catholic Bibles.

Although this Society was the only one of its kind among English Catholics, and great as was the opposition which it excited and from which it succumbed, it must not be thought that the educated members of the Church have been in the least degree forgetful of the deep importance which attaches to Scriptural knowledge in all. On the one hand the laity have been most active in disseminating the Scriptures among their less instructed brethren, although it must be confessed that such activity has not, on all occasions, been guided by prudence. For there were two Catholic gentlemen on the committee of that eminently Protestant *Society for circulating the Roman Catholic version of the New Testament* established in the year 1819, and several well-known Catholic laymen were at least supposed to belong to a London Society bearing the same name. On the other hand, the clergy as a body, while showing an intensely Catholic spirit in the matter, have, at the same time, exhibited almost a restlessness in putting forth new editions of the Rheims Bible, during these last two centuries. The names of Dr. Narys, Dr. Witham, and, more than all, Dr. Challoner, are but three of a long line of devoted and zealous scholars who have tried their hand at what they considered to be a need, the making more perfect of our English Catholic translation, at least of the New Testament. The

opening years of the last century show a wonderful activity among our clergy in this regard. In 1805 the Bible was published in Edinburgh by Moir; in 1807 a new translation of the Psalms was made by Dr. Geddes; in 1811 another edition of the Bible came out in five volumes; in the same year Haydock's was published, and in the following year a second edition of it was called for; in 1813 Syer's Bible appeared, and in 1816 Dr. Troy's; in the same year Dr. Gibson's; in 1818 McNamara's; in 1822 a second edition of Dr. Gibson's; in the same year another edition of Haydock's; and in 1825 Dr. Murray's. And this activity has gone on ever since. Extreme reverence for the sacred text, and an anxiety that the people themselves should become acquainted with its words have been everywhere apparent; nevertheless, anything in the shape of a Bible Society has been very naturally and properly regarded with suspicion, and has been either doomed to failure, or left upon its natural soil of Protestantism, where, so far as Catholics have been concerned, it lacked moisture and withered away.

JOHN FREELAND.

Bedford, England.

THE CAPPELLA SISTINA—ONCE AND NOW.

THE Sixtine Chapel, or rather the choir of the Sixtine Chapel, is one about which much, both good and bad, has been said with more or less reason in days gone by. We all have a vague, perhaps very vague, idea of what it is, and I dare say that most of us know very little about its present condition beyond the fact that Don Lorenzo Perosi is its *Direttore Perpetuo*, nor much more about its past than the fact that "musicos" were employed to sing the soprano parts.

Foreigners, and not merely English matrons with bigoted "Hare" as their only and constant guide, nor only Protestant German tourists with field-glasses strapped across their shoulders, but also American Catholics, and even priests, are

very confident that it is the Sixtine Choir they hear in St. Peter's during Holy Week and on Easter Sunday.

It is not my intention to give undue praise to the Cappella Sistina, nor is anything farther from my mind than to write its complete history. After a brief historical sketch ample enough to give the reader an adequate idea of the origin of the Sixtine Chapel, of some of its vicissitudes in the course of centuries, to enable a better understanding of its present condition, I wish to insert the new *regolamento* by which it is now governed, and add a few notes about its present *Direttore Perpetuo*, Don Lorenzo Perosi.

I.

Song has ever been an integral part of religious ceremony. "The outward persuasive force of religion lies largely in its music, and the religions that have no songs make few proselytes."[1] In the first Book[2] of Paralipomenon the sacred author gives us a detailed division of the musicians and singers, and the second Paral.[3] tells us that when the Ark of the Covenant was brought into the temple with great solemnity, "they all sounded together, both with trumpets and voice, and cymbals and organs and divers kinds of musical instruments, and lifted up their voices on high; the sound was heard afar off, so that when they began to praise the Lord and say, 'Give glory to the Lord, for His mercy endureth forever,' the house of God was filled with a cloud," etc.

That a similar practice was observed by the earliest Christians is clear from the words of St. Paul to the Colossians[4] and to the Ephesians.[5] Just how they sang, what sort of melodies they used, we do not know; they probably retained their Jewish melodies, at least to some extent, but the fact of their singing at liturgical functions is attested by history.[6]

[1] M. Crawford: *Ave Roma Immortalis*, p. 553.
[2] I Paral. 25: 1-35.
[3] II Paral. 5: 13.
[4] Colos. 3: 16.
[5] Eph. 5: 19.
[6] Wernz: *Jus Decretalium*, III, p. 480.

Even Pliny, in his famous letter to Trajan, reports that the Christians sang hymns and canticles in their meetings.

Whether the Popes of the fourth and fifth centuries had a special choir to sing at papal functions in old St. Peter's and in the Lateran cannot be ascertained with absolute certainty. Still this is probable, for at that period Gregory the Great [7] (590-604), recognizing the utility and necessity of liturgical chant, instituted, or at least remodelled, the "schola cantorum." This great Pope seems to have personally instructed his singers. Joannes Diaconus, his biographer, writing in the ninth century, says that in his time there still existed in the Lateran the "lectus" and the "flagellum, quo pueris minabatur veneratione congrua." [8] Gregory favored the "schola cantorum" in a special manner; he had two houses constructed for the use of his singers: one at the Lateran church and the other near St. Peter's. In later years the one at St. Peter's was probably enclosed within the convent of S. Martino, which used to stand where now the statue of Veronica adorns one of the four monster piers supporting the dome of St. Peter's.[9] This statue, be it incidentally remarked, also indicates the spot where the first stone of the new basilica was laid, 26 April, 1506. Dr. Haberl calls attention to the queer coincidence that until 1870 at papal masses in St. Peter's the Cappella Sistina occupied a *tribuna* erected in front of the statue of Veronica. Now it generally has its position in front of the statue of St. Helena.

The stations [10] as observed in the first ages of Christianity stand in close connexion with the "schola cantorum"; they were, perhaps, the occasion of the Pope's founding this special school of singers. Archeologists [11] say that the stations are remnants of the Christian assemblies that took place in the

[7] P. Grisar, S. J.: *San Gregorio Magno*, p. 63.

[8] Joannes Diaconus, II, Cap. VI.

[9] Dr. Haberl: *Bausteine für Musikgeschichte*, p. 8, note 2.

[10] Marucchi: *Elements d'Archéologie Chrétienne*, III, pp. 60-65. "Statio de militari exemplo nomen accepit, nam militia Dei sumus."—Tertullian.

[11] Marucchi, III, p. 61.

subterranean cemeteries and churches on the vigils of the feasts of martyrs.

Pope St. Hilary (461-468) composed a ceremonial of the stational processions. St. Gregory I rearranged them,[12] appointed the churches to be visited and the prayers to be recited; the churches he then assigned for the Lenten Stations being nearly the same as at the present day. At the time of Gregory I the faithful and the clergy of the respective districts[13] assembled in a church not far away from the one in which the station was to be celebrated on that day. The Pope himself came there, accompanied by the Palatine clergy. The "schola cantorum" was there to perform the liturgical chant. Singing litanies, the whole procession moved toward the stational church, where Mass was celebrated either by the Supreme Pontiff himself or in his presence. Before Communion a subdeacon announced the station for the next day in the following words: "Crastina die veniente statio erit in ecclesia N." The "schola cantorum" responded: "Deo Gratias."[14] Stations were also celebrated on other days of the year: during Advent, on Ember-days, Christmas, etc., as may be seen in the Roman Missal even to-day. Thus we see that until the Avignon captivity one of the principal functions of the papal choir or "schola cantorum" was to beautify and to elevate the liturgical ceremonies in the stational churches.

In the year 1305, after a vacancy of ten months, Bertrand de Got, Archbishop of Bordeaux, was elected Pope at Perugia and assumed the name of Clement V. A Frenchman himself, the new Pope obeyed his master, Philip the Fair, King of

[12] Grisar, S. J.: *San Gregorio Magno*, p. 52.

[13] Then, as to-day, Rome was divided into fourteen districts.

[14] In the course of the same day an accolyte would bring to the Pope a small piece of cotton, saturated with oil of the lamp of the high altar, saying: "Hodie statio fuit ad Sanctum N. qui salutat te." The Pope answered: "Deo Gratias." The pieces of cotton thus gathered were preserved and made into a cushion to be placed under the head of the Pope after his death." Marucchi: *Elements d'Archéologie Chrétienne*, III, pp. 60-65.

France, and established himself at Avignon. The "schola cantorum" remained[15] in Rome to perform its functions there. That the papal choir could not and did not flourish[16] at a time when the cattle grazed in St. Peter's and in the Lateran needs no further proof. The Popes in Avignon, however, formed a new choir in their newly-chosen capitol. Benedict XII (1334-42) began to build the "Palais des Papes,"[17] and he was also the founder of the papal choir there. How intimately song is connected with the liturgy of the Church is clearly shown by the fact that even some of the antipopes[18] who devastated the Church from 1378-1417, formed their own special body of singers.

On 17 January, 1377, Gregory XI re-entered Rome and took with him his papal choir, which in the course of years became the "center of the most famous singers and composers of Europe, and which, as an international corporation, providing the cultivation and development of artistic liturgical singing, formed a sort of university.[19]

The term "schola cantorum" disappears in the fifteenth century. After the return of the Popes to Rome the Ceremonials frequently use the terms[20] "cappella pontificia," "papale," "palatina," in opposition to "statio," "processio," "schola cantorum," which names designated the Pope's choir before the Avignonian Captivity.

In the year 1473, Sixtus IV (1471-1484) had Giovanni

[15] Baini against Adami, who on page XIII of his *Osservazioni per ben regolare il Coro della Cappella Pontificia*, Roma, 1711, holds that the "schola cantorum" did not remain in Rome.

[16] Pastor: *Geschichte der Päpste*, I, p. 61. "Je länger die Abwesenheit der Päpste, desto grösser wurde die Zerrüttung. Die Kirchen waren so verfallen und vernachlässigt, dass in St. Peter und im Lateran die Heerden bis zum Altare im Grase weideten."

"Die allgemeine Armut war so gross, dass im Jahre 1414 selbst an dem Feste Peter und Paul keine Lampe an der Confession der Apostelfürsten angezündet werden können." Pastor, I, p. 167.

[17] Now used as a barracks.

[18] Clement VII and Benedict XIII.

[19] Dr. Haberl, III, p. 18.

[20] Dr. Haberl, III. p. 45.

Dolce build the Sixtine Chapel,[21] to be used for the daily singing of hymns from the *Antiphonarium Romanum*, as well as for the annually recurring and certain extraordinary papal functions. Hence the name of "Cappella Sistina," to designate both the material structure and the Pope's choir that ordinarily sang in it.

Sixtus IV built another chapel, which also bore his name: it was the chapel of the Chapter in Old St. Peter's.[22] In the year 1480[23] this same Chapter received instructions to engage ten singers in this newly-built Cappella Sistina. Thus from the time of Sixtus IV until our own day there are two distinct choirs side by side: the Cappella Sistina or the Pope's choir, and the choir of the Chapter of St. Peter's. As stated above, the chapel of the Chapter built by Sixtus IV in Old St. Peter's was also named after its founder Cappella Sistina, but later, at the time of Julius II,[24] the choir of the abovementioned chapel received new and greater resources and then both the chapel and the choir received the name "Cappella Giulia."[25]

There are, however, some very important differences between the two. The Cappella Sistina, now directed by Don Lorenzo Perosi, is paid by the Pope,[26] whereas the Cappella Giulia is supported by special funds, which are managed by the Chapter of St. Peter's.

Ever since the year 1141 boys were no longer employed in the Pope's choir and the sopranos were supplied by falsettos,

[21] The Sixtine Chapel in Maria Maggiore is named after Sixtus V (1585-1590).

[22] Nicholas V (1450) had already planned the destruction of Old St. Peter's, but on account of the great expense a new building would necessarily impose, the plan was not carried out until the time of Julius II.

[23] 1 January, 1480. Bull. Vat., II, p. 208.

[24] Sixtus IV and his nephew Julius II are buried in the chapel of the Blessed Sacrament in St. Peter's.

[25] ". . . . in dicta cappella sub invocatione Nativitatis Beatae Mariae, quae Julia nuncupatur, et in qua corpus nostrum, nobis vita functis, sepeliri volumus, duodecim sint cantores," etc. "In Altissimo," 19 February, 1512.

[26] There used to be special funds also for the Cappella Sistina.

mostly Spaniards and Italians. The unnatural soprano, later on euphemistically called "musico," was not introduced until 1601.[27] The Cappella Giulia, on the contrary, until about twenty years ago, employed only boys and falsettos as soprano singers.

In the Cappella Sistina, moreover, no musical instrument, not even the organ, is ever heard. It is the human voice, the most perfect of all musical instruments, that reigns supreme. "The indescribably beautiful timbre of this music (in the Sixtine Chapel) elevated above everything earthly, which Raphael doubtless frequently heard, perhaps suggested to him the idea to scatter broken violins at the feet of his Caecilia and to leave in parts the portable organ with its loosening pipes which she holds in her hands, while angels' choirs sing above."[28] In the chapel of the choir, however, there are two large organs.

The Cappella Giulia sings daily and also on solemn occasions unless the Sovereign Pontiff be present, and then the Cappella Sistina performs during Mass, but the Cappella Giulia sings during the solemn entry of the Pope. Until 1870, that is, until the present government committed the sacrilegious spoliation of the Church and made the Vicar of Christ a prisoner in the Vatican, the Cappella Sistina accompanied the Pope to those churches of the city in which His Holiness celebrated Mass on that day.[29] At present the only church except St. Peter's and the Vatican in which the Cappella Sistina regularly performs, is the basilica of St. Paul *fuori le mura,* on the 30 June. The Pope's choir also sings at the obsequies of cardinals in their respective parish churches. These two choirs are not exclusive; one can be a member of both, and as a matter of fact, to-day many of those who sing in the Giulia also join in with the Sixtine choir on the few occasions when the Pope's choir sings during the

[27] Ambros, Vol. IV, p. 347.

[28] Ambros, Vol. III, p. 32, note 2. Raphael's Caecilia is now in Bologna.

[29] Remnant of the stational processions.

year. Members of the Cappella Sistina, however, "must abstain from service in other churches during the week preceding any performance." [30]

The pontificate of Sixtus IV (1471-1484) [31] marks a new epoch in the history of the papal choir. His arrangement of the two choirs proved very beneficial for the promotion of sacred music; the best singers from abroad came to Rome where they had an opportunity to exhibit their skill and at the same time to enjoy the many advantages offered to musicians in the Holy City. The Popes also on their part made it a point to engage the virtuosos of Europe for the service of their chapel. Sometimes they even petitioned secular princes to send their ablest men to Rome; thus Leo X asked the Marquis of Mantua to send him his famous bass singer, Michele Lucehese.[32] Membership in the Cappella Giulia became a stepping-stone to membership in the Cappella Sistina, whose members considered themselves as direct successors of the "schola cantorum." Privileges were showered upon the choir at the papal court. Eugene IV (1403) calls them the "familiares et continui commensales" [33] of the Pope. Innocent VIII [34] calls the magister *"Venerabilis frater noster Christophorus, Episcopus Cortonensis,"* and mentions that his successors shall bear the title of Bishop.[35] Moreover, the "cantori pontifici" had certain privileges with regard to trials, attainment of benefices, etc. In short, to be a member of the Pope's choir was as lucrative as it was honorable.

Mgr. De Waal [36] remarks that, although the Cappella Sistina, then as even in our own day, sang behind a trellis to prevent the singers from making undue display of themselves, the lattice-work was not dense enough to ward off the profane

[30] Art. 13, Regolamento.

[31] Haberl, p. 48.

[32] Adami, p. xviii. See Pastor, IV, p. 654.

[33] "Et si erga cunctos," 1 Jan., 1403. Eugene IV.

[34] "Etsi Romanus," 20 July, 1492.

[35] Sixtus V abrogated the privilege and ordered that each year one of the singers should be elected "magister."

[36] *Roma Sacra*, p. 529.

and worldly spirit which in the course of time had so deeply taken root in the Church of Christ. "Joannes Petrus Aloysius Praenestinus, Musicae Princeps," [37] commonly called "Palestrina," was the man chosen by Julius III (1550-1555) to make the necessary reforms. At the age of twenty-nine the young Pierluigi was by a "motu proprio" of Julius III admitted to the papal choir. Pope Marcellus II (1555) [38] in his short reign of only twenty-two days had already proposed to make very radical reforms in regard to Church music. When Palestrina heard of this he at once begged the Pope not to issue any decree until he had heard a mass composed by himself according to the true ecclesiastical spirit. On Easter Sunday, 1555, Palestrina's masterpiece, "Missa in honorem Papae Marcelli," [39] was sung to the entire satisfaction of the Pope. Paul IV appointed him official composer of the Cappella Sistina, and in the year 1571 he was made director of the Cappella Giulia. Living in a small house near Stefano Rotondo, he worked indefatigably for the reform of Church music during his long and fruitful life and developed the polyphonic music to its highest perfection. Pius IV (1564) appointed the Cardinals Vitelozzo and Charles Borromaeus to see to the execution of the Tridentine decree on the reform of Church music in the Pope's choir.[40] In the year 1575 Gregory XIII charged Palestrina with the new edition of the *Graduale* and *Antiphonarium*, which, however, was not completed by him.

With the death of the great and unsurpassed Roman master in 1594 began the decadence of true Church music. A new style of music, the monodic, in opposition to the polyphonic, was introduced, and as early as the year 1614 the promoters

[37] His epitaph.

[38] Adami: "Osservazioni per ben regolare il Coro della Cappella Pontificia." Roma, 1711, p. xi.

[39] This Mass was composed at the time of Julius III (1550-1555), but it was only in 1567 that it received the name, "Missa in honorem Papae Marcelli."

[40] Weinmann: *Geschichte der Kirchenmusik*, p. 102.

of the new school considered the compositions of Palestrina "very beautiful antiquities to be preserved in a museum" (*bellissime anticaglie*), and Giambattista Doni thought them mere *barbarie musicale.*[41] The following example is characteristic of the spirit of the times. Giovanni Francesco Anerio,[42] one of the ablest composers at the beginning of the seventeeth century, was ordained priest at the age of 49, and celebrated his first Mass in the Gesù on 7 August, 1616. All the singers of Rome, formed into eight separate choirs, cooperated in the festivity. Needless to say, all Rome turned out to hear what had been unheard till then. A similar musical exhibition was produced in St. Peter's at the time of Virgilio Mazzochi[43] (1646). For the rendition of one of his compositions he placed his choirs in three different positions: some on the floor, others on the lower edge of the immense cupola, and again others on the uppermost enclosure in the lantern of the dome. The ringing, echoing and reechoing of these choirs thus placed at distances of 150 and 300 feet above one another must have produced a strange effect as they responded to one another. It is said that the Romans suffer from giantism[44] or megalomania, that is, the effort to express greatness by size. "Agrippa builds a threefold temple and Hadrian rears the Pantheon upon its charred ruins; Constantine builds his Basilica; Michaelangelo says: 'I will set the Pantheon upon the Basilica of Constantine.' He does it and the result is St. Peter's." What else was this exhibition of Mazzochi[43] but giantism? Ambros

[41] Conference of Giovanni Tebaldini, director of the choir at Loretto. *Corriere d'Italia*, 13 March, 1907.

[42] De Waal: *Roma Sacra*, p. 530, note 1, where this incident is wrongly related of *Felice Anerio*, who died in 1614. See Weinmann: *Geschichte der Kirchenmusik*, p. 109.

[43] Ambros: *Geschichte der Musik*, Vol. IV, p. 115.

[44] M. Crawford: *Ave Roma Immortalis*, p. 81.

[45] "Era l'epoca quella in cui la nuova magniloquente scuola romana, imbevuta dell' ideale grandioso e scenographico ispiratole dall' ambiente michelangiolesco e berniniano, gia comminciava a traviare, dementicando evidentemente le sue origini e le sue vere tradizioni."—Giovanni Tebaldini, l. c.

adds that such performance could take place only in St. Peter's and that it was only there that it lost the "playful character which it really contained."

Boys (*putti*) and especially falsettos had long been employed in the papal choir to sing the soprano parts. The boys' voices, however, are hard, and, besides, they break before they are perfectly drilled. This, of course, necessitates a continual change of members. The falsetto voices are after all somewhat forced and muffled. On the other hand "taceat mulier in ecclesia" obtained also in Church music.[46] What was to be done? The expedient lay near, and in the beginning of the seventeenth century the "musico" was admitted into the papal choir. Giovanni de Sanctos, who died in 1625, was the last falsetto soprano employed there.[47] These singers, "generis neutrius," appear in Italy for the first time in the beginning of the seventeenth century. Until that time the "nazionali Spagnuoli" served as soprano with falsetto voice. At the courts of princes the "musicos" were employed before that time; they were even transplanted from the secular courts to that of the Popes. At the time of Orlando di Lasso, who died in 1594, there were engaged at the Bavarian court besides 12 basses, 15 tenors, 13 altos and 16 boys, also 5-6 musicos.[48] When Farinelli, a famous "musico" at the Spanish court, appeared in London, a woman, enchanted by the sweetness of his voice, is said to have cried out: "One God, one Farinelli!!!"[49] In the eighteenth century the "musico" took the part of the prima donna in the Italian opera. The French opera never admitted the singers "generis neutrius," but even French writers of that time say that the Italians had great advantages over the

[46] I Cor. 14: 34.

[47] Ambros, Vol. IV, p. 345.

[48] "Am Fürstlichen Durchleuchtigkeit zu Bayern Hoff zu des fürtrefflichen weitberühmten Musici Orlando di Lasso Zeiten die Music daselbst von 12 Bassisten, 15 Tenoristen, 13 Altisten, 16 Kapellknaben, 5 oder 6 Kapaunern oder Eunuchis, 30 Instrumentalisten und also in die 90 Personen starck bestellt gewesen seyn sol." Ambros, Vol. IV, p. 347.

[49] Ambros, Vol. IV, p. 347.

French, because in the first place a woman's voice retains its force and beauty only ten to twelve years, whereas a "musico" will last thirty to forty years; and secondly, the latter can take the part of a woman or that of a man as occasion may demand![50] From the secular courts and from the opera the "musico" has long since disappeared, but, strange to say, in the papal choir he held his place until our own day.

II.

Although the Cappella Sistina no longer retains that fame which made singers from all parts of the world flock to Rome to seek membership in it, it must be admitted that the Pope's choir has lately entered an entirely new epoch of its history. The present calm may be considered as a prelude to a great revival which has already begun and which will surely develop rapidly, owing to the strenuous and persevering labor of its present "Direttore perpetuo."

Don Lorenzo Perosi is the talented son of Giuseppe Perosi, and was born at Tortona, 27 December, 1872. When still in his earliest childhood, his father, who is also an able musician, inspired the young Lorenzo with a profound love for music, little thinking that some day the gifted boy would achieve a world-wide fame. In the year 1890 the young Perosi was appointed organist at the famous Benedictine monastery at Monte Cassino. Two years later he entered the Royal Conservatory in Milan. At the same time, however, he devoted himself to the study of theology and received Holy Orders at the age of twenty-four. In 1893 he went to Ratisbon to take a course in plainchant under the direction of the famous Dr. Haberl. In 1894 he was appointed director of the choir at Imola, but in April of the same year he was called to Venice by the then Cardinal Sarto, Patriarch of Venice, now Pius X, to take charge of the choir in San Marco. Five years he spent in beautiful Venice; he lived in the same house with the present Pope, and they partook of the same frugal meals. In 1899 the *maestro* came to Rome to

[50] Ambros, Vol. IV, p. 348.

direct one of his famous oratorios, the "Resurrection of Christ." Mustafà himself, at the time still director of the Pope's choir, recommended Don Lorenzo to Leo XIII, as his successor in the Cappella Sistina. This is a fact not generally known, but very important for the understanding of what followed. To realize fully the task of the Maestro Perosi it must be borne in mind that from 1870 until the death of Pius IX the Cappella Sistina did not sing at all. From 1878 until 1892 they sang only twice a year. In short, the papal choir had been woefully neglected until the jubilees of Leo XIII began. The Cappella was without system, without a school for boys and without funds; the singers were without practice. Now it was Perosi's task to reduce expenses and at the same time to regain for the Pope's choir some of its former fame. When more than three centuries ago Palestrina was chosen by Julius III to reform the sacred music, he was bitterly persecuted. Facts proved that the race of Palestrina's enemies had not yet died out, and when Perosi began to introduce radical reforms, the adherents of the old system initiated their campaign of persecution and calumny. Nominally Perosi was director of the Cappella Sistina, but the singers, especially the "evirati," had recalled Mustafà, himself a "musico." These strained conditions lasted three years, during which time Cardinal Sarto continually encouraged the *maestro* to persevere in his plan of reform. Perosi triumphed, and his victory was completed by the new regolamento published by Pius X, 20 June, 1905.

As composer he has been very productive. His very first composition published was a "Tantum ergo" which appeared in the *Caecilia* of Singenberger in 1891. His oratorios with which he achieved great success in Rome, Warsaw, Munich, Vienna, Paris, Lisbon, and only last January in Madrid, appeared successively in the following order: Passion of Christ, Transfiguration, Resurrection of Lazarus, Resurrection of Christ, Nativity, Murder of the Innocents, Entry of Christ into Jerusalem, Moses, Last Judgment. Moreover he published a very large number of "melodie sacre," but many of

his best productions, among them a beautiful "Tu es Petrus," have thus far been used only in the Cappella Sistina.

The personality of an artist, though a theme of perennial interest, is one which very often it is better not to enter. The heavenly ideals of the artist's creation seem too often to have found no place in his own life. Of the Maestro Perosi, however, it is but the simple truth to state that, if in his triumph musical critics have rejoiced in the triumph of the musician, all who know him rejoice in the triumph of the man. He is universally esteemed for the uprightness of his character and loved for his gentleness, his simplicity, his kindness. High praise this is,—and knowing how he shrinks from praise one hesitates to write it. It is, however, the mere truth, as all who know him can bear witness.

Jos. H. SCHLARMANN.

Belleville, Ill.

REORGANIZATION OF THE CAPPELLA MUSICALE PONTIFICIA.

Pius Pp. X.

Motu Proprio.

All human institutions destined for the attainment of a certain end are generally governed by statutes and rules, which, in prescribing the proper means to obtain the end in view, must be suited to the conditions and circumstances in which these same statutes are composed and written. But in the course of years conditions change, either in part or totally, and then these same institutions, although retaining the purpose of their founder, must modify the statutes in all those points which have become incompatible with the changed circumstances.

Such necessities generally become manifest either from the frequent infractions of the rules (infractions which can scarcely be avoided altogether) or from the fact that usages which were tolerable in days gone by have become insupportable.[1] To modify the statutes in these cases is not only opportune but even necessary. As regards the singers of Our Chapel, this was very well understood by Our venerated predecessor, Leo XIII, who, not-

[1] Allusion is clearly made to the system of "evirati."

withstanding that by the Constitution *Romanus Pontifex* of Paul III, 17 November, 1545, by the Constitution *In suprema militantis Ecclesiae* of Sixtus V, 1 September, 1586, and by the *Cum retinendi* of Clement XIII, 31 August, 1762, and by other papal acts the corporation of singers of the Papal Chapel had been constituted a real ecclesiastical chapter, nevertheless, acting upon the urgent request of the Director [2] of the Chapel, readily assented, and by an ordinance, approved in March, 1891, granted to those not constituted in major orders dispensation from celibacy. With this ceased by the very fact the membership of the dispensed in a canonical college; one of the conditions necessary for the obtainment of an ecclesiastical benefice being wanting.[3]

Furthermore, it is not to be forgotten that the same Pontiff Leo XIII, of blessed memory, by a decree of 3 February, 1902, ordered that henceforth the parts for the high voices,[4] exception being made for the singers still in office, should, as is natural, be sung by boys.

Since, however, We do not wish that a transient and uncertain state and a system no longer conformable to the needs of the present day should last any longer, and since We have very much at heart the dignity of the ecclesiastical chant at divine service, We have wished to give Our Cappella Musicale a new Regolamento, better adapted to present needs and by which all preceding constitutions and all preceding privileges shall be abrogated and suppressed.

This Regolamento, which We publish as *Motu proprio* from certain knowledge, with the fulness of Our Apostolic authority, by means of this Our present Chirograph, We ordain henceforth to be observed by the members of the Cappella Musicale Pontificia.

[2] Mustafà, the immediate predecessor of Perosi.

[3] A minor cleric, who contracts a valid marriage, loses by the very fact his benefice; not so major clerics, who are to be deprived of their benefices *per sententiam judicis*. C. 3, X, (III. 3); Alex. III (1159-1181).

[4] By this decree the "musicoes" are henceforth, and—as is to be hoped—forever, excluded from the Papal choir.

REGOLAMENTO [5] DELLA CAPPELLA MUSICALE PONTIFICIA.

I. Composition of the Chapel.

Art. 1. The Cappella Sistina shall consist:

(*a*) of a Maestro Direttore, with an annual salary of 4800 francs; [6]

(*b*) of a Vice-Maestro, with an annual salary of 2400 francs; [7]

(*c*) of 2 first tenors and 2 first basses, with an annual salary of 1800 francs each;

(*d*) of 3 second tenors and 3 second basses, with an annual salary of 1200 francs each;

(*e*) of 3 extra tenors and 3 extra basses, with an annual salary of 1000 francs each;

(*f*) of 30 boys;

(*g*) of a secretary and keeper of the archives, with an annual salary of 400 francs.

N. B. Since the choir should always be composed of good material, the appointments of adult singers shall be made, in writing, for a term of five years. A special board shall decide upon the re-appointment for the successive terms.

II. Concursus and Examination of Singers.

Art. 2. The positions in the Cappella Sistina shall be conferred after a concursus and examination. The board for the examinations and payments shall consist of the Maestro Direttore, the Vice-Maestro, and of three other members to be chosen each time by the Majordomo [8] or by the Prefect of the Sacred Apostolic Palace, if the order be referred to him.

Art. 3. In case of equal merits, the priests [9] and the former pupils of the "schola puerorum" shall have the preference.

Art. 4. Every candidate for the position of singer, besides

[5] Constitution and By-Laws.

[6] Since the income tax amounts to about 14-16%, nearly 700 francs of this amount must be paid to the Italian Government, leaving him about 4,100 francs.

[7] At present Mgr. Rella is Vice-Maestro. He also teaches plainchant in the American College.

[8] The Majordomo is the immediate superior of the Cappella Sistina.

[9] From this it may be seen that the tendency still is to have clerical singers in the Pope's choir, provided they can be had.

giving a trial selection to prove the range and quality of his voice, shall be examined on the following points:

(*a*) selections sung in the different keys and musical dictation;

(*b*) a selection of polyphonic music to be rendered at sight;

(*c*) theory and practice of the Gregorian chant.

Art. 5. Each aspirant shall present a certificate of baptism and a testimonial of good conduct from the pastor and the mayor.[10]

III. The Maestro Direttore.

Art. 6. The Direttore shall watch over the moral and artistic progress of the Chapel, and in case of repeated failings he shall report to the Majordomo or to the Prefect of the Sacred Palaces for the proper provisions.

Art. 7. Besides the Gregorian melodies the Maestro Direttore shall also select the best compositions of classical polyphonic music; but he may also make use of the modern sacred music written for the voice alone.[11]

IV. The Vice-Maestro and the Magister Puerorum.

Art. 8. The Vice-Maestro shall have charge of the school for boys,[12] whom he shall manage and instruct as prescribed by a special regolamento.

Art. 9. He shall direct the Chapel in the absence of the Maestro, at the rehearsals as well as during the performances, and he shall impart the necessary instructions to the singers.

Art. 10. The Vice-Maestro shall be present at all rehearsals and performances directed by the Maestro.

Art. 11. It shall be the task of the Vice-Maestro, without special pay, to transcribe in modern notes those old scores of the archives of the Chapel, now preserved in the Vatican Library, which may be needed for performances or rehearsals.

[10] Each singer must present a testimonial of good conduct, signed by the pastor and by the mayor of his town or city.

[11] Because, as mentioned before, no musical instruments are used in the Cappella Sistina.

[12] The Maestro instructs the upper course—that is, those boys who already form a part of the Cappella Sistina; the Vice-Maestro has charge of the lower or preparatory course.

V. The Singers.

A. Tenors and Basses.

Art. 12. The singers shall bear the title "cantori pontifici." [13]

Art. 13. The singers shall be obliged to be present at all exercises, rehearsals, and performances announced by order of the Maestro, and to abstain from service in other churches during the week preceding any performance.

Art. 14. In case of absence caused by sickness they shall present a statement signed by a physician.

Art. 15. During the services the "cantori pontifici" shall wear a violet cassock and cincture, a collar, and a pleated surplice; this costume they shall procure at their own expense.

Art. 16. The singers may, and are even advised to, engage in some other profession outside that of music.

B. Boys.

Art. 17. There is a special regolamento for the boys.

VI. Discipline during the sacred functions.

Art. 18. The singers, having received their parts from the secretary, shall be present on the gallery a quarter of an hour before the time set for the sacred function.

Art. 19. They shall observe absolute silence during the functions.

VII. The Secretary.

Art. 20. The secretary shall have charge of the ordinary archives of the Chapel.

Art. 21. He shall distribute and collect the parts during the functions and rehearsals.

Art. 22. He shall announce the time for rehearsals and functions.

Art. 23. He shall be present at all rehearsals and performances, and shall always be at the disposal of the Direttore.

Art. 24. The secretary shall carefully write the records [14] of

[13] Shortly after the time of Sixtus IV (1471-1484) they were commonly called "cantores palatini."

[14] Dr. Haberl quotes an interesting specimen from the records of the year 1546: "1546, die Martis, 19 Martii. Blasio [one of the singers] data est licentia sirupandi per dies 15." "3 Aprilis Blasius per totum absens 15 bajochi [the sum deducted from his salary] completi sunt enim dies purgationis illius." (!!)

the Chapel and submit the same to the Superiors for approbation at the end of the year.

VIII. Pensions.

Art. 25. Singers, after having served six terms (30 years) shall, on withdrawing, be entitled to a pension amounting to four-fifths of their regular salary.

IX. Honorary Members.

Art. 26. Lovers of sacred music who have for three years served in the Chapel shall, after an examination, receive the title of "cantore pontificio onorario."

X. Punishments.

Art. 27. The punishments in case of transgression of the present regolamento shall be reserved to the Majordomo or to the Prefect of the Sacred Apostolic Palaces.

XI. List of the Functions in which the Cappella Musicale Pontificia Participates.

Art. 28. The Cappella Musicale Pontificia shall take part in the functions of the following occasions: [15]

(1) Immaculate Conception.
(2) Christmas.
(3) New Year.
(4) Epiphany.
(5) Candlemas.
(6) St. Joseph's.
(7) Annunciation.
(8) Holy Week.
(9) Easter Sunday.
(10) Ascension.
(11) Pentecost.
(12) Corpus Christi.
(13) St. Peter's.
(14) On all Sundays [16] of the year, except the Sundays from 1 July till 31 October, and the first, second, and third Sundays after Easter.
(15) On the anniversary of the Pope's death.
(16) Anniversary of the Pope's coronation.
(17) Public consistories.
(18) Obsequies of Sovereigns and Cardinals.
(19) At the customary ceremonies, before, during, and after the Conclave.
(20) At any other function, also extraordinary ordered by His Holiness.

[15] This is planned for the future. At present the Cappella Sistina does not sing on all these occasions.

[16] The idea is to give the choir a chance to perform in public and to

XII. The Present Members of the Chapel.

Art. 29. From the day on which this *Motu proprio* will be made known to the present members of the Chapel, they shall be subject to the new regolamento (receiving the same salary [17] as before) until the thirtieth year of their service, after which time they shall receive the full pension.

XIII. Extraordinary Receipts and Aid Fund.

Art. 30. Extraordinary receipts shall henceforth be divided in the following manner: of the amount received by the Cappella, the school of the boys shall receive 8 parts,[18] the Maestro 3, the Vice-Maestro 2, each of the first tenors and first basses present 2, the secretary 2, and every other "cantore pontificio" present 1 part.

Art. 31. The Majordomo, or the Prefect of the Sacred Palace, shall have the administration of the charitable fund already existing and shall manage the distribution of the revenues as heretofore.

Given in Our Apostolic Palace of the Vatican, on the twentieth day of June, 1905, in the second year of Our Pontificate.

PIUS PP. X.

give the public an opportunity to hear the choir. Of course, the Pope will not be present on these Sundays.

[17] Those who were members of the Cappella Sistina when the new Regolamento was published will continue to receive the same salary as before, and after thirty years of service they will receive a pension equal to their full salary. Those, however, who joined after the publication of the new Regolamento will receive the salary determined therein (which is smaller), and after thirty years of service they will receive a pension equal to four-fifths of the regular salary.

[18] Supposing the Cappella Sistina would receive 175 francs; then this sum would be divided into 35 parts. (See Par. I, art. 1 of this Regolamento for the number of members.) The school of the boys would receive 40 francs, the Maestro 15 francs, the Vice-Maestro 10, etc.

SCHOOL [19] OF THE BOY-SINGERS OF THE CAPPELLA MUSICALE PONTIFICIA.

Supplement to the Regolamento, Art. 17, 20 June, 1905.

I. The School and the Boys.

1. The school of the boy-singers shall be in the Scuola Pia Pontificia until a special boarding school can be erected.

2. The number of the boy-singers shall not be less than 30.

3. The school shall be divided into two courses: the upper and the lower.

4. The pupils of the upper course shall receive a monthly payment which will be deposited in a Savings Bank.[20]

5. Except in case of departure from Rome and in case of his death, no sum whatever shall be drawn on the bank-book until the possessor become fifteen years of age.

6. The boy-singers of the Cappella Pontificia shall not be allowed to sing except under the direction of the Maestro or Vice-Maestro of the same Chapel.

II. The Maestri.

1. The Maestro Direttore shall see to it that the boys receive daily instruction.[21]

[19] The Scuola Pia Pontificia, situated in the Piazza Pia at the entrance of the Borgo, was founded by Pius IX. The school, which is in charge of the Fratelli di Nostra Signora della Misericordia, is frequented by the boys of the Borgo families and of those employed in the Vatican. At present the boy-singers are taken from the pupils of this school. The daily rehearsals also take place in this school. The general rehearsals take place in the new Sala or hall which has been erected in the rear of the Scuola Pia and which is to serve for the reunions of the grown pupils of the Scuola Pia as well as for the concerts of the Maestro Perosi. When completed the Sala will hold 1,500 persons.

[20] They receive from 5-20 francs a month, according to ability.

[21] The rehearsal takes place at 5 p. m. daily, except Sundays and holidays. The boys are very much attached to their Maestro, and he is justly proud of them. Some time ago illness prevented the Maestro from appearing at one of his rehearsals. When the boys became aware of this they all proceeded to the Palazzo Taverna, his home, to express their sympathy. The porter, however, refused the crowd admittance, but they immediately appointed a committee, which was sent up to fulfil their mission. At times he may be found playing with the boys at the school before rehearsal.

2. The Maestro shall recite the usual prayers before and after rehearsals.

3. The lesson shall never be shorter than one hour.

III. The Guides.[22]

1. The choir of the sopranos and that of the contraltos shall each have two guides.

2. The salary shall be determined each time according to the funds of the school, and the appointment shall not last more than five years.

3. The appointment of the guides shall be made without a concursus, but they shall be chosen by the Maestro with the approbation of the Prefect of the Sacred Palace.

IV. The Censors.[23]

1. The upper course shall have two censors; the lower course, one. They shall be chosen from among the best boys by the Maestro and the Vice-Maestro.

2. The censors shall have the duty to keep record of absences and fines[24] of each single pupil in perfect order.

3. They shall distribute and collect the parts and keep the music in order.

4. In case of illness of any one of the pupils, the censors shall visit the sick member and report about his condition.

5. The two censors of the upper course shall receive a monthly remuneration; however, they shall not participate in the distribution of the fines.

6. They shall keep the records of the fines in good condition and present them to the Maestro for his approval at the end of each month.

V. The Prefects.

1. A prefect, chosen by mutual agreement between the Maestro Direttore and the Superior of the religious in charge of the Scuola Pia, shall be present at each of the two courses.

[22] These guides serve to give the boys greater surety and firmness. According to the new regolamento they are to be falsettos and not "musicos."

[23] The censors receive 20 francs per month.

[24] A few examples of fines: Absence without excuse, 50 centesimi, which is equal to 10 cents of our money; disorderly conduct during rehearsal, 10 centesimi, which is equal to 2 cents of our money. These fines are distributed among those who are not fined.

2. It shall be the duty of the prefects to accompany the boys to their respective families after rehearsals.

VI. The General Prefect.

1. The General Prefect shall have charge of the administration; he shall be responsible for the discipline of the school, and, together with the Maestro Direttore, he shall distribute the premiums for the bank-books of the pupils.

2. At the end of each year he shall present the books for approval to the Prefecture of the Sacred Apostolic Palaces.

3. Every item of expense shall be accounted for.

4. Apart from the current expenses, no expenditure shall be made without the consent of the Maestro Direttore.

5. It shall be the duty of the General Prefect to keep the outfit of the scuola—cassocks, surplices, lights, etc.—in good condition.

THE COLLECTS OF THE ROMAN OFFICE.[1]

II. The Medieval Cursus.

IT has already been said that the structural secret of the early liturgical forms is to be traced to the rhythmical system known as the *Cursus*. With regard to this system an important distinction must be made. There are in fact two kinds of Cursus, depending upon the difference between measured and accented words. The former gives us metre, based on the quantity of syllables, the latter rhythm based on the accents of words. Latin, in its early days, was an accentual language, and it was only by degrees that the laws of quantity, borrowed from the Greeks, began to be applied to it. The principle of quantity prevailed during the classical ages and beyond them; by degrees, however, the old accentual system asserted itself, side by side, at first, with metre, but ultimately (about the fifth century) superseding all notion of quantity.

Working back from the rhythmical Cursus, the rules of which were formulated in the eleventh century, and in which M. Noël Valois was the first to reawaken interest, successive

[1] Cf. Eccl. Review, May, 1907, pp. 537-547.

writers have found that the system can be traced to an earlier date than was at first imagined, in literature and in liturgy. Mgr. Duchesne has proved that the Cursus revived in the eleventh century was professedly a return to the Latin forms of St. Leo's time.[2] The first to call attention to a metrical Cursus was Dom Joseph Pothier, who, in that monumental work, *Les Mélodies Grégoriennes*, pointed out that in the early liturgical formulas some account seems to have been taken of quantity. Dom Pothier wrote thus in 1879, but it was not for many years after that the hint thrown out by him was justified in detail from an independent source, and in an indirect manner. It has been remarked by Père Edmond Bouvy that the prose cadences of Greek rhetoricians from the seventh century onward were regulated not by quantity but by accent. Professor Wilhelm Meyer, of Spires, pushed still further his investigations and formulated the simple rules which had guided Greek writers from the third to the sixteenth century. At the same time he remarked that though both Greek and Latin authors of the decadence followed simply the rhythmical rule of accentuation, in earlier times and in the classic age of both tongues prose was regulated by the metrical laws of quantity. At this juncture Monsieur L. Havet, professor in the Collège de France, undertook an examination of Latin writers anterior to the sixth century, and made a special study of the prose of Symmachus. He expected to find a rhythmical Cursus, but discovered, instead, a system based on the laws of prosody, in fact a metrical Cursus.

In order to gain a comprehensive and clear view of the subject, it will be convenient to approach it from behind, so to speak, and to consider first its later development. A short history of the Cursus in the Middle Ages will, therefore, be in place here. I have said that as far as ecclesiastical authors are concerned, St. Leo the Great (440-461) represents the

[2] I wish to acknowledge, once for all, my great indebtedness to the Rev. Father A. de Santi, S. J., whose very able papers, reprinted from the *Civiltà Cattolica*, have been closely followed in the present article. "Il Cursus nella storia e nella liturgia."

acme of dignified metrical prose. Even in his time quantity was ceasing to be the only factor employed for producing pleasant forms; the actual principle which was coming into prominence was destined ultimately to supersede quantity. By the seventh century the change was complete, and Latin prose became incorrect, harsh, and weak. Toward the eleventh century, with the gradual revival of culture, the great difference between the style of those days and that of earlier ages was remarked, and the need of improvement was recognized. Thus originated a great number of works on style, which appeared between the twelfth and sixteenth centuries, under the names of *Ars dictandi* or *Summa dictaminum*, or simply *Dictamen*. One of the earliest and most important of these tracts was the *Ars dictandi*, written by Alberic, a monk of Monte Cassino (1075-1110). Alberic's avowed aim was to assist letter-writers, letters being then, and for two good centuries after, the most extensively cultivated form of literature. Letter-writing was in fact a "rage," and it produced those collections of *Epistolae* which may be found in Migne's Latin Patrology of the eleventh and following centuries, some of which reach the high-water mark of worldly tediousness. Many of these letter-writers were monks, and St. Bernard gives a vivid description of the evils to which the love of epistolary correspondence led, — the numerous distracting thoughts, vanity in searching out fine expressions, waste of time. Writers sometimes considered their letters a point on which mortification might be practised. Thus Peter of Celles excuses his silence to a Prior of Molesmes by saying that the days (of Holy Week and Easter) had been taken up with thoughts of our Lord's death and resurrection: "Quid enim digitis meis cum calamo scribere in die quo distenditur in cruce Dilectus ex dilecto?" And later on he adds, in the true medieval spirit, that no one but Pontius Pilate is recorded to have written during those days! As a rule such letters were dictated, and some of the great letter-writers acquired such facility that they could simultaneously dictate letters on various subjects to three scribes while they themselves wrote a

fourth. These scribes, or *dictatores* as they were called, were in great request, and skill in composing letters was one of the surest ways to preferment in Church and State.

The earlier *dictatores*, Alberic and his followers, seem not to have professedly chosen special forms for concluding phrases; they simply recommend a good arrangement of words in order that the period may flow well and sweetly as in Cicero's prose. However, in their works we find the cadences which later on came to be purposely used; this may be a mere matter of chance, but more probably it is the result of constant use of St. Leo's prose and of the liturgical prayers.

There were two forms of Cursus, the Isidorian and the Hilarian, which had a certain vogue in the eleventh century. The former consisted of childish playing on words, especially at the ends of phrases, with cadences all of the same type and frequently rhymed. This extravagant style was thought to correspond to that of St. Isidore's *Book of Soliloquies*, and to some minds of that time it was redolent of "piety and joy and intelligence." To us it seems simply ridiculous and ineffably tedious. Who, for instance, could read much Latin in the style of the following examples: "Mittimus vobis hominem innocentem plenum melle sine felle; plus enim habet mellis quam fellis, plus amoris quam horroris; simpliciter prudentem et prudenter simplicem; turturem cum castitate et columbam cum simplicitate."

The Hilarian Cursus is no better; it left nothing to chance, and its rules were as precise as a medical prescription. Take a bisyllable, then a word of four syllables with short penultimate; repeat as often as desired. Thus: *Tolle viaticum,| frater charissime, | vade Coloniam, | jussis obedias.|* Or again, take a trisyllable with long penultimate and another with short penultimate: *Majestas regia | praecepit firmiter | ut nullus audeat | pacis fedcra | violare.* John the Englishman, who also admired the Isidorian Cursus, tells us that the Hilarian was always used *propter sui nobilitatem*, and in proof of its excellence he quotes a letter written by a cleric to his bishop, excusing his absence from a synod. Here is a

specimen: "Cum essem in itinere, | tendens ad vestram sinodum, | caput meum infirmitas | oppressit ita subito, | quod despero resurgere | portumque vite tangere, | nisi Dei clementia | me visitare marcidum | condignetur. Quare, Pater mitissime, | vestra dignetur gratia | infirmo mihi compati, | meque languentem habeat | excusatum." But this is blank verse, formed on the most common form of the ecclesiastical hymns. The only sense in which St. Hilary can be made responsible for such meanderings is that the first iambic dimeter hymn ("Primo dierum omnium" of Sunday's Matins) is said to be his composition.

These extravagant mannerisms were reprobated by all the good writers of the time, and the famous *dictator* Boncompagno of Florence wrote his *Dictamen* professedly for their repression. In his work he commends the prose of the Roman Curia and of the Imperial court. Another renowned *dictator*, Thomas of Capua, chancellor under Pope Gregory IX, also praises the *gloriosa Romana Curia* from which come all good things, the art of good writing included.

This Roman style, as a matter of fact, was simply St. Leo's Cursus reduced to rule. The Papal chancery had always maintained a certain grave and dignified style, which may be traced to the influence of St. Gregory the Great, whose *Registrum* was for a long time the model of all the Pontifical letters. The forms used by St. Gregory were preserved with still greater exactness in diplomatic documents and apostolic privileges, etc., but the prevalent bad taste was felt even there. When at length the need of reform made itself felt, it was found necessary to take as model a clearer and more sonorous style than that of St. Gregory, which, though very literary, was not sufficiently regular to be made the base of formulated rules. The choice fell upon St. Leo the Great, as we know from a passage in the *Liber Pontificalis*, to which Mgr. Duchesne was the first to call attention. Among the chief reformers was Pope Urban II, who, on his election in 1088, went to Monte Cassino; the *Dictator* Alberic was still alive and from his school the Pope chose his chancellor, viz. John

of Gaeta, who afterwards became Gelasius II. Urban is said to have selected John "ut per eloquentiam sibi a Domino traditam antiqui leporis et elegantiae stilum, in sede apostolica jam pene omnem deperditum, sancto dictante Spiritu Dei gratia reformaret, ac *leoninum cursum* lucida velocitate reduceret." [3] The result was not slow in appearing: in the letters of Urban II, subscribed by John, the *cursus* is in evidence, and it becomes more and more prominent during the first half of the twelfth century. During the short pontificate of Gelasius II (1117-1119) the school reached its highest fame, which it maintained under Honorius II (1124-1130) and Eugenius III (1145-1153). It is remarkable that, while the Papal Bulls conformed to the newly formulated rules, privileges and such like documents preserved the ancient forms, which had become so familiar as to have acquired the force of law.

It is probable that from the beginning of the reform movement there were written rules, but they seem to have been the secret property of the Roman Chancery. The first to divulge them was another monk of Monte Cassino, Albert di Morra, who was made chancellor in 1178, by Alexander III. During the following ten years the composition of Papal Bulls was in his hands, and part of his duty being to instruct the notaries in the special style of the Curia, he felt the need of putting his teaching in writing. Albert in his turn became Pope under the name of Gregory VIII; the Cursus which he had finally fixed became the rule, and was called after him *cursus Gregorianus*. His book, *Forma dictandi*, has never been published; it exists in a twelfth-century MS. preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. M. Noël Valois has incorporated the substance of it, and also extracts from it, into his *Etude sur le rythme des Bulles pontificales*. The chief principles may be summarized here. The Cursus takes into account only two feet: dactyls and spondees, and it deals with them, not according to laws of quantity, but merely on the accentual principle. Thus, every word of two syllables, what-

[3] *Liber Pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, Vol. II, p. 311.

ever the quantity of those syllables, is a spondee, as *omnis, via, pater, mater;* every word of three syllables is a dactyl, as *reddidit, filius, celebrat.* A monosyllable counts as a half spondee, and thus a trisyllable accented on the penultimate is regarded as a spondee and a half. Polysyllables are cut into so many spondees, counting backward from the tonic accent. Thus *domi-nati-ónem* is composed of three spondees; *aggredi-atur* of two spondees and a half; *mi-seri-cordia* of a dactyl and a spondee and a half. Do any of our readers begin to wish that their school days had been cast in those palmy days when there was such pleasant freedom regarding prosody?

The feet being thus decided, "Cursus dictaminis romane curie taliter observandus est," says Albert di Morra: if you begin a sentence with a dissyllable, you will do well to continue with a dactyl, as *Deus omnium.* If you begin with a trisyllable with accented penultimate, the next word may be a dactyl, as *magister militum.* But take care not to have too many dactyls together, *quia nimis sunt veloces;* so on in detail. This for the opening of sentences, where, however, a certain freedom was allowed.

With regard to final cadences the rules were more strictly fixed. Albert di Morra gives two forms: the first, afterwards called *Cursus planus,* consists of a word of four syllables with long penultimate, preceded by a dactyl, as *gaudia pervenire.* The last word might be represented by equivalents, for example, *agere nimis dure,* or *sufficere ad volatum.* The second form, known later on as the *Cursus velox,* is composed of two trisyllables with accented penultimates, as *audire compellunt;* or of a word of four syllables and another of three, as *confidenter audebo.* These two cadences, however, did not furnish sufficient variety, and Trasimondo, vice-chancellor of the Roman Court and a disciple of Albert, distinguished a third, the scheme of which is represented by *operari justitiam,* which he called *Cursus ecclesiasticus,* and which has also been qualified as *durus* and *tardus.* The last epithet is the one by which it is best known.

These three Cursus were made the subject of treatises

written by the various *dictatores*, each one suggesting, according to his taste, the most becoming forms for use in the different parts of a composition. The preference was generally given to the *Cursus velox;* one *Dictamen* says: "Cursus velox majorem ornatum efficit et ideo a dictatoribus communiter acceptatur," ending his phrase, as Padre de Santi remarks, with a fine specimen of his favorite cadence.

Other forms affected by medieval writers but not indicated in the rules of the period were doubtless based on the cadences of St. Leo's prose. The following are frequently found: (1) A dissyllable followed by a word of four syllables with long penultimate, as *dona sentiamus*, or *esse videatur*. The Benedictines of Solesmes, who were the first to remark this cadence, have christened it the *Cursus trispondaicus*, since it is composed of three spondees: *esse* | *vide* | *atur*. (2) A dissyllable followed by a word of five syllables with short penultimate: *virtutis operatio*. This cadence is called by Canon Grospellier *Cursus dispondeus dactylicus*. (3) The *Cursus octosyllabicus* composed of a trisyllable followed by a word of five syllables—both words having short penultimates: *fletibus supplicantium*. (4) Lastly, Padre de Santi points out another form which had not hitherto been noticed, and which he calls the *cadenza media*. It is composed of two trisyllables with weak penultimates, as *jugiter postulat*, or of a weak trisyllable and a dissyllable, *precibus nostris*, or of a dissyllable and a weak trisyllable, as *fo* | *vemur meritis*. It will be convenient to give a table of the seven cadences already described:

1. p	=	*cursus*	*planus*	audiri compellunt.
2. t	=	"	*tardus*	operari justitiam.
3. tr	=	"	*trispondaicus*	dona sentiamus.
4. dd	=	"	*dispondeus dactylicus*	virtutis operatio.
5. v	=	"	*velox*	
6. o	=	"	*octosyllabicus*	fletibus supplicantium.
7. m	=	"	*medius*	jugiter postulat. precibus nostris. fovemur meritis.

All these literary forms are found in the liturgical pieces of the period (eleventh to twelfth centuries) in which they were in vogue, and they are also recognizable in the Latin works of Dante and Petrarch.[4] In the Mass and Office for the feast of Corpus Christi, the greatest liturgical composition of the thirteenth century, St. Thomas uses all the familiar cadences. Striking examples may be seen in the three prayers of the Mass:

"Deus qui nobis sub sacra*mento* mirabili (t)
passionis tuae memo*riam reliquisti* (v),
tribue quaesimus (m)
ita nos corporis et *sanguinis tui* (m)
sacra *mysteria venerari,* (v)
ut redemptio*nis tuae fructum* (tr)
in nobis *jugiter sentiamus.* (v)

Ecclesiae tuae, *quaesumus, Domine* (m)
unitatis et pacis *dona concede,* (p)
quae sub oblatis muneribus (t)
mystice designatur. (v)

Fac nos, *quaesumus, Domine* (m)
divinitatis tuae sempiterna fruitio*ne repleri* (p)
quam pretiosi corporis et *sanguinis tui* (m)
temporalis per*ceptis praefigurat.* (v)

The Cursus is equally in evidence in the lessons of the second nocturn for the same feast, as well as in those for the feast of the Stigmata of St. Francis, written by St. Thomas's great friend, St. Bonaventure.

The medieval Cursus, as we have here attempted to describe it, was at its best from the pontificate of Innocent III (1198-1216) to that of Nicholas IV (1288-1292). Toward the end of the latter reign the decadence set in; the apostolic notaries, with a few honorable exceptions, became more and more careless, and by the fourteenth century the Cursus had completely vanished from Papal Bulls. Then came the Renaissance, with its return to the theories of Cicero and Quintilian, and Latinists, had they known of such simple devices as the Cursus furnished, would naturally have overlooked

[4] See *Il Cursus*, pp. 28 ff. for examples.

them. The new ideal was a return to the best Latin of the Golden Age, and for this end the surest method was that which left the choice of cadences to an ear carefully cultivated by the study of classic models.

BENEDICTINE.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

A NOTABLE COLLECTION OF RELICS FOR OXFORD.

SOMETHING has just happened which makes an English treasure-trove, until now in private hands, a matter of general interest to the Catholic public, clerical and lay. This is the legal transference to the Church of Saint Aloysius in Oxford, of the entire contents of the local Oratory of the late Hartwell de la Garde Grissell, Esq. Mr. Grissell, who died on 10 June, 1907, at Rome, was a convert, a resident of the University City, a Master of Arts, and a Chamberlain to the last three Popes. As the well-known host of a most hospitable house, near Magdalen College, he was hardly ever, when at home, without some distinguished guest; and in all his interests and doings he was intensely Catholic as only Catholic Englishmen are. And now that he has suddenly died, the long-used Oratory will be such no more, and the sanctuary light will go out, and no man will be secretly moved to salute the Majesty of Love, passing down Longwall into the High.

It is a gaunt plain house, but it was wonderful to some of us, being stacked full from top to bottom of curios and antiques, and enriched, especially, with holy things; for Mr. Grissell was devoted to relic-collecting, and had almost unrivalled opportunities, during his ever-recurring stays in Rome, for the pursuit of that rather medieval profession. By his Will, probated during this August, he left his whole property of that kind to the Lord Bishop of Birmingham in trust for the Oxford Church, to which he had been, all along, a kind benefactor. This Church was opened in 1875 by Cardinal Manning, and was erected, thanks to a fund left by the Baroness Weld, by the Jesuits, the immemorial nursing-fathers of the Midland

missions. The generous gift just mentioned was handicapped, however, by a most difficult condition, to wit: that a suitable Chapel-room for the relics, and an additional Sacristy for the vestments and ecclesiastical furnishings, should be added to the existing Gothic Church, and should be ready for use within two months after the admission of the Will to probate: otherwise Westminster Cathedral was to be the beneficiary! An almost insuperable obstacle against the likelihood of Oxford being the winner in the case lay in the fact that the congregation, not a rich one, was pledged to rebuild its Elementary Schools at St. Clement's. Counting in Church, Chapel of Ease, Convents, institutions,—in fact every local centre of Catholic life except Pope's and Hunter-Blair's Halls, and our scattered University student body, who have a chaplain of their own,—the entire flock in question numbers not quite one thousand. The Rector, the Rev. Arthur F. Day, S. J., was therefore determined that no appeal should be made to the parish for further aid, although so tempting a prospect was unexpectedly held before himself, his little community, and their spiritual family. The minimum sum required was thought to be some five hundred pounds. By dint of persistent prayer, of much correspondence far and wide, of letters in *The Tablet*, and the spontaneous coming forward both of friends outside and of a few individual Oxonians, enough was soon promised to make it sure that the great legacy need not be forfeited by its natural inheritors. Nothing, however, but Fr. Day's selfless energy could have pushed the matter through, and done it so quickly, in the teeth of very great discouragements. Best of all, the architects who were consulted advised, instead of any addition to the fabric, the somewhat less expensive adaptation of the existing Baptistery, which is convenient and roomy, to the purposes of a feretory; a vestry only is to be thrown out from it, facing north. This work is now well under way. A few more fairly generous contributions would insure its complete thoroughness and worthiness. It is hoped that by mid-October, when Michaelmas Term will have begun, the relics may lovingly be carried

up from their old resting-place to the fair Church to which they must be so interesting an historical, so vast a devotional gain. There are few collections resembling this, or so well authenticated, anywhere in modern hands; certainly in all Great Britain and all America, there is no such memorial garden of the friends of God.

These family jewels of the Church must have, for all of us, an inherent preciousness, as we have toward them a never-failing reverence. But as regards the lavish multiplication of them, the subject has about it something revolting, no doubt, to our increased respect for personality, and our more squeamish habits, in latter times, of dealing with ourselves and others. It was natural enough to the rough Middle Ages to break up, haggle for, buy, steal, hoard, and carry to and fro the bones of the Saints. These were then considered by all nations the most desirable of treasures, and in the acquisition of treasure, have not men, however religious, always shown bad manners and bad taste? There was no "problem of pain" then: pain was given and taken without our alleviating surgery and our sentimentalizing fuss; and as living dismemberment in hand to hand warfare was the order of the day, so was dismemberment considered no dishonor in death, even when those subjected to it were the objects of intense Christian veneration. The practice of reducing to gold-dust, as it were, the wrought gold of human holiness, did not begin with devotees. The earliest Saints, as we know, were all martyred. Were they professed, or even suspected followers of Him who was in His day hated by the world, magistrates and populace were ready to serve the fancied security of the State by tearing them limb from limb; so that wherever their glorious flesh was rescued from wild beasts, or flame, or the sea, it was distributed just as it was, in the poor faithful scraps and leavings of the perfect temples of the Spirit. Usage and tradition must have formulated at once that it could be no harm to subdivide and share what was already so fragmentary. Well, we have acquired now—what shall we call it?—more delicacy, on the whole. We incline to honor our blessed ones without such

greed of personal possession as would expose their sacred remains to a process of constant disturbance and indiscriminate piecemealing. It is to be noted, in this very inventory of Mr. Grissell's treasures, how many of the more recent Venerabili and Beati are represented by some fragment of their clothing, by a lock of hair, or by a holograph, and not any more by vertebrae and praecordia. It seems as if we may not unfitly rejoice that devotion in this matter holds its own, though decimation has, at least in non-Latin countries, become largely obsolete. The feeling of the future will doubtless be that the angel-guarded bodies of the Saints should sleep untouched till the Resurrection; yet as Catholics, we have our duties toward the results of nearly two thousand years of more impulsive dealing. It is too late to pick an ethical quarrel with it. In whatever form there has come down to us the precious wreckage of mortality which is mysteriously inseparable from Christ and His cause on earth, we know how to value it, *orc et opere*, in and for Him.

Now the late Mr. Grissell was not a dilettante intent on forming a specialist's museum: he was a devout layman with a lifelong eagerness to gather in and house from mutable chances the things whose worth is apparent only to the eye of faith. The catalogue of his successes is somewhat miscellaneous. It is seen to be richest, at a glance, in primary relics of the Early Christian Martyrs, and poorest, perhaps, in those of the illustrious English Martyrs of Tudor and Stuart times, as of those of lay Saints in general. A notable group of souvenirs of the beloved St. Philip Neri is an outstanding feature. Autographs are many; and they are genuine beyond cavil. Let it be admitted that even one-third of the objects in the various reliquaries may have to a critic no ascertainable standing, that the probabilities are against their being what they have formerly been believed to be. In many such matters, as we have been reminded by one who knows, "a little intelligent agnosticism is the prerequisite of faith." Discount as liberally as we need or wish, there is yet a great residuum here of truth and fact. Our principle (one of our

most difficult principles for Protestants to follow, although it is the simple outcome of our more intimate concern) is that it were better to revere relics mistakenly, than disclaim or scorn them, so long as there exists the smallest grain of a chance that the objects may be dear to Almighty God, and should have for us "the relish of eternity." Any other theory of action would be, in a Catholic, both unbecoming and unloving.

There are ornate reliquaries of various shapes and materials in Mr. Grissell's domestic Chapel, not yet dismantled. Most of these have many contents encased together: nine or ten may be a fair average. First in number, as in importance, are the twenty-five items traditionally connected with the Infancy, the Public Life, and the Passion of our Blessed Lord. Chief among the last section are a piece of the True Cross, set in rock crystal, and three large portions of the Crown of Thorns, which were for long in the possession of Charles Albert, King of Sardinia. We find also fragments of the white robe in which Christ was clothed when brought before Herod, and a fragment of Pilate's written Title, on Calvary. Next, come in order small supposed secondary relics both of Our Lady and of St. Joseph, a primary one of St. John Baptist, and another of St. John the Evangelist; one each of SS. Mark, Luke, Thomas, Thaddeus, Philip, and James the Less; two of St. Simon; three each of SS. Barnabas and James the Great, besides one of the latter's mother, St. Mary Salome; four of St. Andrew, and the same number of St. Matthias; and no fewer than five of St. Bartholomew. There are four of SS. Peter and Paul.

Of the first Christians, not Apostles, to shed their blood for their Master, we have several here of the most illustrious and familiar names: the protomartyr, St. Stephen; SS. Sebastian, Felix, Cyprian; SS. Lucy, Perpetua, Philumena, Felicia, and other virgins and matrons of the great persecutions, taken into Roman Churches from the Catacombs, long ago, and authenticated by the Roman authorities. Here is many an ampulla of blood, and many an urn under some episcopal

seal, with its graven name and palm. Lapidary inscriptions are not lacking: a full and perfect one is that of St. Sabbatius, whose body was translated from the Catacombs of Gordianus, in the reign of Pope Innocent XII, to a Florentine Chapel. "*Sabbati, dulcis anima*, (so it reads, in precious testimony to the oneness of Catholic practice) *pete et roga pro fratres, pro sodales tuos.*" Again, for a second instance out of so many, here stands a strong vase containing the ashes of St. Simplicia, with an inscription in Greek characters; below is a line, *Fausto et Gallo consulibus*: this fixes the date at 298 A. D. The memorabilia of early Martyrs in this collection are conspicuous by their great number. Mr. Grissell was a Roman by residence as well as an Oxonian, and the results of his pious industry are predominantly, and all but exclusively, local, that is, Roman: this circumstance is in itself, to those who know the cautious scholarly Roman temper, a note of authenticity. There are a hundred more major relics in this group, some very large, some anonymous, mere star-dust from the Diocletian darkness; and there is one of the Altar-stones used in the Catacombs; and sand from the Janiculum; and a chalice full of Agnus Deis sopped of old in the blood and the ashes of the soldiers of God; and many a vessel of crystal, jasper, bronze, or dark stone, which would be dear to archeologists, because it is *nominis proprii*. One of these contains the body of St. Theodore, one a leg of St. Hyacinth, and another the head of St. Rosina, V. M., from the Catacombs of Saturninus, translated on 3 March, 1659; traceable at every remove, in fact, until it came into Mr. Grissell's hands. Not least in interest and pathos are the relics of the boy-Martyrs Faustinus, Justin, and Valentine; and of those wonderful Martyrs of Japan, who alone of the modern world recall to every reader of their annals the heroic sweetness and sheer gayety under torments of the early Christians. Beneath the Altar lies the body of St. Pacificus (not to be found in Alban Butler's *Lives*) which was moved from the Catacombs to Cardinal Pentini's private Chapel, and by his brother, a Canon of St. John Lateran, given to Mr. Grissell. In the *mensa* is

set a portion of the wooden Altar from the house of Pudens the Senator, on which, according to tradition, St. Peter the Apostle was wont to celebrate; and in the super-Altar are ranged the relics of eleven known Martyrs of the first centuries of the New Dispensation.

Disposed all about, in small receptacles, are relics of the great Founders and Reformers like SS. Benedict, Bernard, Francis, Dominic, Teresa, Ignatius, Charles Borromeo. It is humanly pleasant to find laid close together SS. Monica, Ambrose, and Augustine; as also SS. Francis de Sales and Jane Frances de Chantal: friends who could never lose one another in earth or Heaven, as says that great heart St. Augustine, because they were dear to one another in Him who cannot be lost. St. Agnes and St. Aloysius are here in one reliquary too: kindred angelic spirits, despite a thousand years of temporal separation. One cannot but trust that the mortal crumb of B. John Vianney, the Curé of Ars, will soon be placed nearer to that of his much-beloved patroness, St. Philumena!

The most casual glance at the multitudinous names here will show us those starry ones of St. John Chrysostom; St. Thomas Aquinas, (three relics); St. Alphonsus Liguori, and his namesake Rodriguez; SS. John and Paul of the Cross; St. Anthony of Padua, (three relics); St. Pius V; St. Leonard of Port Maurice; St. Peter of Alcantara (two relics); St. Frances of Rome (three); St. Margaret of Cortona (three); St. Elizabeth of Hungary (two); St. Jerome Æmilian; St. Martin of Tours; St. Rose of Lima;—how unscientific look the hallowed names, tumbled on to the page without regard to their chronology, nor to their rank, age, sex, and avocation! treated thus like the children of eternity which they are.

A great honor it is for Oxford to possess a bit of the tunic of St. Francis of Assisi; and how interesting that will be to the Franciscans, newly re-settled there. Here is also a piece of the habit of St. Bernadine of Siena, and of St. Charles Borromeo's linen, and of a garment of St. Vincent de Paul; a strip of what was for forty-five years the winding-sheet of St. Francis Xavier, and his worn biretta; the silk which lined

St. Stanislaus Kostka's coffin and the veil in which his young body was wrapped; and the thin gold-colored shroud of that golden soul, Catarina Benincasa of Siena, and a gold rose which for eighty years was part of a coronal resting against her hair.

Mention of St. Francis Xavier reminds one how rich is this collection of Mr. Grissell's in heirlooms of the Society of Jesus. It includes a bust of St. Ignatius, with a primary relic enclosed, one of two such in our list, besides a piece of his vestment and a brief, written in his own hand throughout, appointing Simon Rodriguez to the headship of the Portuguese Province. Not counting the shroud, there are two more relics of St. Stanislaus; and one bone of St. Francis Borgia, as well as a tiny part of his chasuble and his autograph signature; and three relics of St. John Berchmans, exclusive of a note written by him, which Mr. Grissell got directly from the Novitiate at Rome. The Church dedicated to St. Aloysius Gonzaga, is now to hold four considerable relics of him, besides a holograph letter in a singularly beautiful hand. Other letters or signatures carefully preserved here are those of SS. Leonard of Port Maurice, Joseph Cupertino, Crispin of Viterbo, Camillus de Lellis, Andrew Avellino, Charles Borromeo, Pope Pius V, Alphonsus Liguori, Vincent de Paul, Francis de Sales, Catherine Ricci, Catherine of Siena, and Blessed Peter Canisius, S. J.

The objects connected with St. Philip Neri have already been referred to as of extraordinary interest: enough to drive the English Oratorians (who, alas for the enforced quenching of Newman's hope! have no house in Oxford) quite green with godly envy. These may be roughly listed as follows, and admit no doubt of their historic authenticity:

1. His death-mask, in the original wax.
2. A lock of his hair.
3. Another of the same.
4. A piece of linen stained with his blood, and some of his blood besides.
5. A small bone, in an oval case containing also relics of SS. Thomas Aquinas, Teresa, Bernard, and others.

6. Two fragments of his linen.
7. His stock.
8. A towel long used by him.
9. A piece of his alb.
10. A piece of his stole.
11. A portrait of him, painted in oils on copper, enclosing a relic.
12. His copy of the Poems of Jacopone da Todi, with his autograph on the flyleaf.

In the same class, perhaps, with this last item, but more personal, is a manuscript illuminated by St. Catherine of Bologna, which once belonged to Pope Pius IX, and is one of the most artistic of Mr. Grissell's acquisitions.

Lastly, and of incomparable value to English Catholics, are the too rare memorials of their own Saints. That of S. Alban Protomartyr, is from Cologne, transferred afterwards to Santa Maria de Pace, and was given to Mr. Grissell in 1870 by Archbishop Malchus. The enshrined portion of St. Thomas à Becket's chasuble is from the Cathedral of the city of Sens, where he spent his sorrowful year in 1164; the two relics of St. Edmund Rich, Archbishop of Canterbury (once an undergraduate, and later a don, of the University of Oxford) come directly from Pontigny, where his incorrupt body has slept ever since his death there in exile, in the year 1242. One rejoices to see little ornate boxes and lockets bearing the names of St. Bede the Venerable, St. Chad (two relics), St. Simon Stock, who is not always remembered as an Englishman; and that most attractive of Queens, the noble St. Margaret of Scotland. But best of all to certain partisan eyes is the concrete witness of our predecessors of yesterday, the magnificent Martyrs under royal tyranny and the penal laws. These are not so many here as they might be; there are better collections of the same sort at Stonyhurst College and at Erdington Abbey; but if there is to be any future increase and enrichment of Mr. Grissell's feretory, such increase and enrichment might well be devoted to this particular section. As things stand, however, we have two relics presented to our love and

veneration of B. Thomas More. There are likewise two of Fr. Robert Southwell, the exquisite poet who made the staunchest of martyrs; and the same number both of Fr. Thomas Whitebread, and of Henry Garnet, the celebrated and much-maligned Provincial; and one of that most interesting character, Henry Walpole, and of Edward Oldcorne; all Venerabili of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, all members of the Society of Jesus, all happy and willing witnesses unto death to the Catholic faith, and the integrity of the Apostolic See. Most touching of all, perhaps, is a little relic of a glorious Elizabethan, Edmund Campion, S. J., who was once a University Proctor, and dearly loved every stone of the Oxford which, after all (to quote Newman's famous word) was "never unkind to him." Of the blessed Franciscans harvested at Tyburn, we seem to draw very close to the Ven. Thomas Bullarker, for here, as one of his two relics, is a cloth dyed with his blood; and to Ven. Henry Heath, the ardent soul whose dying sigh, "Jesus, convert England" has become the watchword of the great Guild of Ransom. A manuscript diary may be handled of the Ven. Arthur Bell, O. S. F., who suffered in 1643. There are locks of hair (most endearing of all memorials!) of Fr. Bedingfield, and of the Ven. Charles Baker, alias David Lewis, S. J. One may count three relics of the saintly Irish Primate, Oliver Plunkett, the most innocent of the many innocents who perished through the monstrous injustice of the English mind in King Charles II's time. His cause is being energetically pushed forward at Rome. These names do not quite exhaust the list of modern martyrs who may be venerated together at Oxford.

By the terms of Mr. Grissell's bequest, the Church of St. Aloysius is also to inherit all the vestments, ecclesiastical furnishings, altar-plate (silver only), frontals, candlesticks, vases, priedieus or foldstools, liturgical books, etc., which until now have been in use in his own Oratory. The vestments, of which there are very many, are extremely beautiful, after their own fashion. Unfortunately, their fashion is in the main Neapolitan, and of the late Renaissance; and all the

intricate riot of gold arabesques, beadwork, painted flowers, butterflies, and what not (miracles of cost and skill) cannot put out of sight the fact that the vestments, in form and detail, are merely decorative and non-symbolic, and therefore essentially unecclesiastical. Mr. Grissell had no great appreciation of the beautiful gracious old Gothic shapes, so right in feeling, and so nobly worked once in his native country that the best Church embroidery was for centuries known as *opus Anglicanum*. Very attractive, however, are the altar frontal in rose-color for Laetare Sunday, a thing once obligatory which we rarely use now, or see; and the white Easter stole with its Alleluias; and the great cope, the orphreys of which are ornamented with the arms of Pope Paul III.

Much local interest should always centre in the pictured Madonna called Our Lady of Oxford, which hung for years over the private altar in High Street. It was richly indulgenced by Pope Pius IX. Many a fervent prayer on behalf of those outside the Fold has gone up past it like incense, and many a young heart, kneeling before it, and invoking Our Lady, has found the gift of Faith. Not far from it will hang a large crucifix carved in wood, decorated in gold and colors, representing Christ our Lord as robed, crowned, and stoled, as the King and High Priest, and Victor over whom death can never prevail. This was from a Burgess design, and intended for the Chapel of the late Marquis of Bute at Cardiff Castle; but for some reason Lord Bute never set it up there, and gave it instead to his friend Mr. Grissell. It is not generally known that up to a date well into the tenth century, or thereabouts, all crucifixes were of this mystical and solemn pattern. Realism in the matter is a modern boldness. A painted rood, with figures of the Blessed Virgin and St. John, is also among the minor items of the very rich legacy which has made glad the little Catholic flock in Oxford.

Probably not many readers of the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW know the Church into which the relics here roughly and incompletely summarized, will shortly be gathered. It will be sought out more generally in future than it is now, when it is

never a day without visits from strangers, despite its annoyingly obscure, though central, position. It stands next the Presbytery, at the bottom of the Woodstock Road, on one of the great northern highways which converge in the boulevard-like St. Giles Street, and almost opposite St. Giles Church; but it is, unluckily, nearly concealed by a row of mean brick houses, standing where there should be a stretch of lawn, between the fine façade and the road. St. Aloysius's is by no means great, architecturally, but it is a restful church, with no touch of the superfluous, or of inharmonious color. The general style is Early English, with some strong arches of a semi-Norman sort, with good capitals. The very wide nave is lighted by a range of splayed clerestory windows; the high flat vaulting is poor, however, and though the chancel is spacious, there is no chancel arch. Oxford is famous for the beauty of the reredoses in New All Souls, and Magdalen; and the modern stone reredos of St. Aloysius, modeled upon them, with its rich decorated detail, and its apsidal form, presents a double tier of figures of Saints, each in its niche, clustered about the soaring alabaster Throne. Pulpit and baptismal font have much the same character of sculptural richness with simplicity. The side chapels are not obtrusive, and are full of taste and charm when found; the woodwork in all is artistic. From end to end St. Aloysius's is what may truly be called a devotional church, and it is exquisitely kept. Treasures such as these bequeathed by Mr. Grissell's Will are surely more fitly venerated in a quiet place like this than they would be at Westminster. Oxford is universally known, being in the channel-bed of the stream of all intelligent travel. We welcome anything which serves to emphasize its deep-cut historical Catholicism. To how many is this apparent? Only to the most thoughtful, to those who read and know, not only the medieval story, but the story of those many Martyrs and Confessors of ours who, on this merely academic ground, withstood the Reformation as it was withstood nowhere else in England save by the people in Yorkshire and the West. As for the living evidences of the ancient Faith, they are not

much to the fore in this old "hotbed of the Recusants." Oxford has been on fire for religion more than once, but her abiding supernatural renewal is yet to come. It will be incalculably good for the streets of the drowsy University town, to witness a procession of transfer, this October, whether the purpose and spirit of it be fully understood or not. It is well to make it plain, now and then, that the Saints, our brethren, can never be to us Catholics absent or dead. They are too much tangled up, root and fibre, with the perfection which is our own ideal, and with the fragrance of the nearness of God. A man who has no ear for theological terms can yet be made to understand that He constitutes all their reflex value to us, and that any translation of the relics of His friends, is, by something more than mere analogy, to stir up, and spread, His sweetnesses abroad. On such an occasion, many may well wish to send encouragement and blessing and congratulation to a little English community, somewhat shy and individualistic, and hard to weld in one. *Surge illuminare, Jerusalem!*

L. I. GUINEY.

Oxford, England.

AN HISTORICAL SKETCH OF THE TEMPORAL POWER.

II.

THE TURN OF THE TIDES.

THE close of the twelfth century was a period of war and violence. Princes, barons, and the lower grades of the feudal caste attacked each other in their effort to gain power and plunder. It was in the midst of such scenes, in 1194, that Frederick II, son of Henry VI, was born. Henry had marked his reign with unheard-of atrocities, especially in Sicily, so that Pope Celestine III, in order to put a check upon these cruelties, found himself forced to excommunicate the reckless prince. Henry, however, defied the pontiff's censures and continued his career of rapacity and bloodshed. When, four years later, Innocent III was elected Pope, matters were brought to a crisis by his attempt to annul the Magna Charta,

the charter of England's liberties, which John Lacland had been forced to sign. Innocent III may have realized his mistake, but if so, death prevented him at the opportune moment from correcting it. Yet the reign of Innocent was not without fruitful benefits in other respects. He had found on his accession to the papal throne that nearly all the possessions of the states to which the Church laid nominal claim, had come under the control of adventurers. He set to work, and in an incredibly short time evicted the intruders, a work in which he had the full coöperation of the Italians. Camerino, Ferno, Spoleto, Perugia, Benevento, and other cities professed their submission, and received in return their charters of freedom. They were required to pay a small yearly tribute, and in case of war they pledged themselves to raise a number of armed men for mutual protection. These cities thus became practically republics allied by friendly treaty to Rome. Having accomplished so much, Innocent III turned his attention to the administration of justice within the Papal domain, and reorganized the courts, putting down bribery and other corrupt practices. Thus a new era of temporal rule sprang up under his government of drastic reforms. A born ruler of men, he struck the needed blow at the right time and made himself the real master of his dominions. "He was not," writes Döllinger, "so much the restorer as he was practically the first actual founder of the Papal States." A maker of kings, he may be said to have sinned by exceeding his talent, for he advanced to the regal throne the man who did more to humiliate the papacy than any sovereign during the Middle Ages.

On 25 November, 1198, Innocent III assumed at the request of the queen mother the legal guardianship of Frederick, son of Henry VI. Violent contests were going on at the time, north and south, in the empire, over the pretended rights of rivals to the throne. Philip, one of the claimants, fell by the dagger of an assassin. Otho, who succeeded in obtaining recognition of the Pontiff for a time, proved himself a traitor to his pledges and was excommunicated. Finally, in

1215, the Pope's ward ascended the throne. He was crowned at Aix-la-Chapelle, as Emperor of Germany, under the title of Frederick II, and four years later, 20 November, 1220, received the imperial purple at Rome. From that day he became the bitterest foe of the Pope, and if we except the periods of hypocritical peacemaking, he never ceased to harass the Roman Church. He had pledged himself to undertake a crusade for the delivery of the Holy Sepulchre from the yoke of the Turks. This promise he tried to evade. In like manner he made light of all other guarantees for the preservation of peace and order in the south and east of Europe, which he had given upon his ascending the throne. As a result of this faithlessness, the Pope, Gregory IX, on 29 September, 1227, issued a bull of excommunication against the emperor. Frederick at once revenged himself by urging the sovereigns of Europe to combine in a simultaneous attack upon Rome, which was the common check to their political ambitions. But he found it more difficult than he had expected, to escape the dire effects of ban and inderdict, which pursued him everywhere, and caused him to be avoided, like a leper, by all who remained loyal to the Church. Finding no consecrated hand willing to place the crown of Jerusalem on his head, he entered the Church of the Holy Sepulchre which had been laid under ban, and there haughtily crowned himself. However, on his return to Europe he deemed it the better part of valor to make peace with Gregory IX, which he did by treaty at San Germano, 28 August, 1230. In this compact with the Pope he had promised to restore the lands which he had seized from the Church; to permit the return of exiled bishops; and to keep aloof from all interference in episcopal elections. Six years later we find him actively engaged in urging on the Romans to rise in revolt against the Pope, while he himself was endeavoring to beat back his enemies in the north. During the succeeding three years without respite he waged war on the Holy See, whilst the Pope on the other hand was making endeavors to form the different cities and provinces into a league to meet his imperial foe in the field.

Again Gregory found himself forced to excommunicate and depose Frederick, which was solemnly done on Palm Sunday of 1339. This resulted in another treaty of peace between the emperor and Innocent IV, the successor of Gregory, 31 March, 1244, only to be broken anew by Frederick who turned his army against Rome. Innocent took flight and escaped to Genoa, whence he made his way to Lyons in France which became for a time the papal residence.

One is confronted at this juncture with the vacillating conduct of the Romans, whose enthusiasm varies between fleeting outbursts of devotion to the pontiffs and ready betrayal of their interests to any foe who showed himself strong enough to enforce his threat of chastising them for their loyalty to the papacy. No matter what reforms might be instituted, what liberties granted, in the turn of a hand a host of turbulent citizens could arouse the populace to arms and bid them rush on the residence of the Pope and threaten his life.

Boniface VIII died 27 June, 1304, and for the next eleven months the Cardinals in the Conclave were divided into two sections, neither party offering the slightest prospect of their agreeing with the other. At last, on 5 June, 1305, the Archbishop of Bordeaux was elected, and took the title of Clement V. Having been installed at Lyons on 14 November, he declined to leave France, and after spending four years in changing residence from city to city, decided at length, A. D. 1309, on remaining at Avignon. This was the beginning of what some writers have called the Babylonian Captivity of the Papacy.

Meanwhile Italy remained in a state of uproar and political ferment. Louis of Bavaria, an excommunicated prince, had himself crowned as temporal ruler in Rome, 17 January, 1328, by Sciarra Colonna, and on 18 April he set up an anti-Pope, Pietro Rainalducci, who assumed the title of Nicolas V. But there was not much time allowed either Louis or his anti-Pope to enjoy their successes. The sentence of excommunication against Louis, when read publicly, brought about the defection of many of his followers. And the advance of

Robert, King of Naples, upon Rome so alarmed him that he fled immediately. The anti-Pope who accompanied Louis as far as Pisa, finally reached Avignon, and having submitted to the Pope was allowed to rest in peace. He was the last of the anti-Popes set up by monarchs, to advance their interests, and Louis, his master, was the last German Emperor upon whom the blight of excommunication had settled. The factional strife between the various powerful families of Rome, such as the Colonna, Orsini, and others, continued, whilst their rightful sovereign, the Pope, together with his administration, was dwelling in Avignon. It was during this period that Cola di Rienzi, an adventurous and bold descendant of a once powerful family, Crescenzi, seized the opportunity of making himself master of the city. He had ample ability to succeed in his project, but he was unhappily wanting in prudence and administrative wisdom. Assisted by the papal authorities he summoned the Roman people to the Capitol, and in 1347 proclaimed Rome a new Republic, with himself as Tribune. His ascendancy was both rapid and decided, for in a short time he had restored the city to order and tranquillity. Soon, however, he began to burden the people with heavy taxation that he might provide for the becoming splendor of his estate. He also took it upon himself peremptorily to order the Pope to return to the city, and demanded that the rival claimants to the throne of Germany, Louis the Bavarian and Charles Margrave of Moravia, appear in Rome and have their rights and titles adjudicated before a Roman tribunal. Having by such excesses of power and authority drawn upon himself the censure of the Pope and the ill-will of the sovereigns, he soon lost the prestige which his courage and administrative ability had foreshadowed, and he was obliged to flee from Rome. He was captured in 1350 and brought to Avignon, where he was imprisoned. The old condition of disorder resumed its place in the Papal States, and the country was being overrun with adventurous princes and petty tyrants. Innocent VI, determined to put an end to this state of things in the old papal dominions, sent the Spanish Cardinal Albornoz

to Italy that he might restore order. Rienzi, having been appointed Senator by the Pope, accompanied the Cardinal, together with a tolerably well equipped army. The Roman populace welcomed their Tribune with acclamations of joy, but a few days later found their brutal diversion in hacking him to pieces at the foot of "La Cordonnata," whilst his wife looked on, as he died, from a window of the Palace. After these events Cardinal Albornoz vigorously pushed on his work of coercing the nobles who were tyrannizing over the people; and in this he was thoroughly successful. Order was restored and political freedom was granted to several Italian cities. These results were not to be of long duration, however.

In the mean time the clamor for the return of the Popes from Avignon had never ceased in Rome, although the opposition of the princely factions was only increased by this popular desire. The Visconti openly rebelled against the temporal power, and a League was formed among a number of municipalities to throw off all civil obedience to the Pope. The Florentines led the way, and both Guelph and Ghibelline (who had up to this time been at deadly enmity with each other) joined hands, in their efforts to eliminate all title of the reigning Pope to the pontifical states. Their banner bore the legend, *Libertas*, and with the exception of a few cities such as Lucca and Sienna, all followed the Florentine lead. At this juncture we meet with the courageous Catherine Benincasa, since known in the world's history as St. Catherine of Siena. She came out of her convent solitude and bade the people have patience and above all to remain loyal. Against the attacks of Bologna, Perugia, Viterbo, and others, which had joined the Florentine League, in 1376, Gregory XI had meanwhile equipped an army under the command of Robert of Geneva, a Cardinal, afterwards Clement VII. The Florentines, owing to internal dissensions and treachery, began to lose heart at the rapid approach of the papal army, and made overtures for peace. The city authorities sent ambassadors to St. Catherine, begging her to plead for them before the Pope. She came from Siena, and was welcomed

like a triumphant monarch at the gates of Florence. The citizens placed their cause entirely in her hands and promised to send ambassadors after her to Avignon, to ratify whatever terms of peace she would consent to. On 18 January, 1376, she arrived at the papal court and was enthusiastically received by the Pope. He, like the Florentines, placed the settlement of the estrangement in her hands, and promised to abide by her decision, the preservation of the honor of the Church being alone recommended to her by him. But what she had prepared to effect was partly undone by the insolence which the ambassadors of the Florentines displayed on their arrival at Avignon, with the result that peace was not finally concluded until during the reign of the succeeding Pope.

The return of the Popes to Rome was all important for the preservation of the temporal power. But the good results which, naturally speaking, should have accrued from the change, were nullified by the bewilderment and chaos into which the Catholic world had fallen over the various claims to the chair of St. Peter. The city of Rome had almost fallen into ruins, and the Romans while offering their loyal submission to the Pontiff were discontented and discouraged at the disorder around them. Although Martin V had concluded to return to Rome, in A. D. 1418, he had to desist and remain at Florence, owing to the occupation of Rome by the Neapolitans, who had also seized Benevento. When in October of 1421 he did enter the city, he found it, as a writer says, "so dilapidated and forlorn that it no longer presented the appearance of a city. One might see the houses tottering to their fall, the temples prostrate, and the streets deserted; everything wore the appearance of decay, of neglect long continued beyond redress. Want and misery were stamped on the faces of the inhabitants." Nevertheless the Pontiff entered triumphant amid the acclamations of the people who flocked out to meet and lead him into the city. This was in 1421. For forty years the Romans had been without a Pope residing among them. They seemed to rejoice in the restoration of their ancient birthright; yet, hardly thirteen years after the ad-

vent of Martin V, we find Eugene IV flying from the city and taking up his residence at Florence, where he remained for nine years. If the picture drawn on the advent of Martin V gives us the impression of ruin and decay, that which Ranke paints of the condition of things on the return of Eugene IV from Florence is appalling. Rome had become the residence of herdsmen; citizens and *contadini* of the Campagna mingled amid the ruins. "Cattle wandered about as in a village. From San Silvestro to the Porta del Popolo all was garden and marsh, the resort of wild ducks. The very memory of antiquity was fast sinking. The Capitol had become the 'hill of goats,' the Roman Forum was the 'cows' field.'"

In time these things were changed by the activity of succeeding Popes. Under Nicolas V (1447-53) Rome acquired a splendor in the artistic, and renown in the literary world, that have lasted down to our own day, and will probably be spoken of while history is written. All historians, however antagonistic to the papacy, agree in singing the praises of Nicolas V as a patron of letters and art. He founded the Vatican Library and stored it with precious manuscripts obtained from the East. But, what is to our particular purpose at present, he left nothing undone to restore peace and prosperity within the boundaries of his States. He worked without ceasing, and with great success, to better the condition of his people. It is no wonder then that he died of a broken heart when he discovered a plot against his life, hatched by Porcano, a Roman noble. His aim was to establish a Republic. The plot being discovered, its principal author and abettors were seized, tried, and all of them executed in January, 1453.

On the accession of Sixtus IV, A. D. 1471, peace reigned once more in the Peninsula. The actions of this Pontiff, however, soon caused Florence to become a scene of bloodshed, with the Medici and Pazzi struggling for the supremacy of that city. On 26 April, 1478, while Lorenzo and Julian Medici were assisting at High Mass, they were set upon by an armed band. Julian was murdered on the spot. Lorenzo escaped,

and afterwards retaliated by ordering everyone in any way suspected of being connected with the murder to be executed. The Archbishop of Pisa was one of those. Sixtus IV, to blot out the stain caused by the murder, excommunicated the Florentines, who were the authors, but who showed no compunction for their misdeed. The Siennese aided the Pope and war was carried on against the Florentines until 1480, when a threat from Louis XI, and the seizure of Otranto by the Turks, made the Pope halt in his policy of revenge, and release the Florentines from censures. On the whole Sixtus IV is not a pleasing character in ecclesiastical history. By his action in raising two of his nephews to the Cardinalate; giving places of emolument to something like sixteen relatives; and selling ecclesiastical dignities to the highest bidders, he brought shame and disgrace on the Church. Instead of making peace he kept alive the old Roman feuds, and we do not wonder that before his death he saw his people rise in revolt against him.

In the transition from Sixtus IV to Julius II, it is merely necessary to glance at the Pontificates of Innocent VIII and Alexander VI. The former was titled the Father of his Country for having made peace between the families of the Colonna and Orsini, since peace between them was a boon to the people at large. Alexander VI with characteristic liberality handed over a large portion of the States of the Church, the Duchy of Benevento, to his son John. And when the latter was succeeded by his brother Caesar, the Pope began a warfare on everyone claiming any shadow of independence within the confines of papal territory. His drastic measures brought him a measure of success. It was left for a better man to settle finally the authority of the Holy See in papal territory. This was Julius II.

On the death of Alexander VI, the Cardinals to the number of thirty-seven unanimously elected Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere as Pope. He was in exile at the time, for Alexander VI and he were inveterate enemies. Fearing the animosity of Alexander, he had gone into exile in France, where he spent ten years. He is an almost unique figure in

ecclesiastical history. He had been a mariner in his early years, and was remarkable for the energy of his actions. On his election he took the name of Julius, being the second Pope of that name. He then made it the one object of his life to build up the power of the papal authority within the States of the Church. He seized on the possessions of Caesar Borgia, and drove him into exile; made war on the Bentivogli of Bologna; the Freduccini of Fermo; the Baglioni of Perugia; and drove them from their strongholds. He then restored the ancient privileges of those cities, and re-annexed them to the States of the Church. Against Venice, which represented a formidable political faction, he also waged war. It had seized upon Rimini and a portion of the Adriatic sea-board. Julius formed a league with the emperor of Germany, the kings of France and Spain, in order to strengthen his power, and so to regain this tract of land. Seeing his determination, the Venetians submitted and restored all that was asked of them. The House of Este, in the person of the Duke of Ferrara, next demanded the attention of Julius. The duke claimed the suzerainty of all the States of Italy, and for this previously unheard-of demand Mirandola was besieged. The followers of the duke capitulated; he himself was banished. This led to grave complications with France, which do not, however, bear on our main subject. Whatever may be said of the warlike attitude of Julius II, it must be conceded that he showed himself to be a capable ruler of those territories belonging to the occupant of the chair of St. Peter. He restored the States to the position they had formerly occupied, and he subdued those who were accustomed to lord it over the people and scoff at papal civil laws. He showed clearly that if he was supposed to rule his States, he meant to do so in very fact. And his vigor and decisiveness left petty tyrants within his territories to understand that what each had to do was to protect his own property, and, for the rest, faithfully observe the laws made for the benefit of the people. Thus Julius II may be regarded as at once the reformer, the protector, and the restorer of the Temporal Power.

III.

Ebb Tide.

Whatever successes the Popes of the last five centuries have had, these successes did not lie in the direction of increased political power. With the pontificate of Julius II there begins a gradual lessening of that spirit which had made warriors and leaders of political factions of churchmen, and which fostered in the Church a more or less dominant insistence upon temporal ascendancy as distinct from that independence which the Kingdom of Christ on earth claims against secular interference. God's providence as exemplified in the Old Testament economy, has made it possible that Church and State should go hand in hand, the one assisting the other in spreading a knowledge of the Father's Law. It is this—the Law of God—that the Church has to preach; everything else is subsidiary, only a means to an end. Human ambition and man's inherited weakness may make the exercise of this divine economy at times and in many cases impracticable. The world, and more particularly the world's rulers, find the doctrines of Christ antagonistic to and in the way of their earthly aims and progress. Hence under various pretexts war is waged on the Church. France of to-day is not doing a whit more against the Church than Venice did under the pontificate of Paul V, or Austria under the "Sacristan" Joseph II; although to-day there are no papal dominions to invade. For centuries the States of the Church furnished the secular lords with a pretext for quarrels, and the energies of the Holy See were often expended in warding off the attacks of princes who forced upon her compromises humiliating to her spiritual superiority.

Under Paul IV (1555) the Duke of Alva had gathered an army beneath the walls of Rome, and threatened the Pope and the city with destruction. His successor, Pius V (1566), realizing that the political power of the Papacy was on the wane, made a fruitless attempt to regain what was lost; and some measure of success appeared to follow, which was taken

up by Sixtus V (1585). He improved the condition of the people, especially the poorer classes, and put down the brigands that were infesting every quarter of the States. In 1596, under Clement VIII, the duchy of Ferrara was once more restored to the Holy See; and in 1631, on the death of the last duke of Urbino that duchy was also given back to Urban VIII.

Practically a new order of things began in 1648, when the Treaty of Westphalia, which concluded the Thirty Years' War, was signed by the interested powers. The terms of this treaty were offensive to Catholics, and the conditions specified in it were implicit violations of his recognized rights of the episcopate. The papal Nuncio at Münster protested against the terms, and Innocent X issued a Bull condemning the treaty as unjust.

On the death of Innocent X, Cardinal Chigi, who had acted as Nuncio during the negotiations of the envoys to the Peace Conference, was elected Pope, and took the name of Alexander VII. He became embroiled in a conflict with Louis XIV of France, with the result that the latter sent an army to invade the States of the Church. A treaty was concluded at Pisa, 1664, but Louis did not cease to give trouble and to humiliate the Holy See, as is proved by his quarrelsome insistence in the case of Clement XII regarding the so-called right of Regalia—*droit de régale,* an ancient prerogative claimed by the kings of France. This privilege insured them certain revenues from vacant bishoprics and gave them the right of disposing of numerous benefices during the time of the vacancy. Innocent XI, Clement's successor, received every species of insult from the representatives of France at Rome, and was beaten in the fight over the right of Regalia. Avignon once more was seized by the French, but during the short pontificate of Alexander VIII, was restored by Louis XIV.

In A. D. 1700, the King of Spain, not having issue, bestowed the succession to the Spanish throne on his grand-nephew, the Duke of Anjou, grandson of Louis XIV. The

new monarch was crowned as Philip V. But there was a rival claimant in the person of the Archduke Charles, brother of Joseph I, and son of Leopold I of Germany. Although in this conflict the Pope had observed strict neutrality, the Emperor Joseph had been induced to suspect that Clement was favoring Philip and hence set to work to wreak his vengeance on the Pontiff by invading the papal states. At the same time an awkward turn in affairs in Spain brought the Pope into conflict with Louis XIV. Lord Peterborough, one of the English generals, made a bold dash on Barcelona, and captured it. He proclaimed a renewal of ancient rights to Aragon, and the Austrian was declared King of Spain, under the title of Charles III. The German Emperor's troops were marching on Rome in response to a threat of excommunication from Clement XI, and a treaty had to be concluded. In this the Pope recognized Charles III as King of Spain and Naples. But for this act he had now to face the anger of the French, who retaliated by driving the papal representatives out of Spain. Between the two fires Clement XI suffered a series of gross humiliations.

Even at this date it can be seen that every act of the European governments pointed the one way—the subjugation of the Pope and the seizure of his territory. Austria and Germany was jealous of France; England desired to outdo the other nations; while Spain was making a vain endeavor to come again to the front and lead the destinies of Europe. Italy proved to be the bone of contention among Spain, France, and Germany. The treaty of Utrect settled matters in a fashion, but it brought the Pope into collision with the new king of Sicily, Victor Amadeus of Savoy, who had made himself obnoxious to the Pope by his arrogant pretensions. It was a serious quarrel and led the way to yet more serious things. Charles VI wrested the duchies of Parma and Piacenza from Innocent XIII, and handed them over to Don Carlos, son of Philip V. Clement XII made an effort to recover Parma, in 1731, but failed; and his successor, Clement XIII, encountered considerably more trouble over this duchy

than any of his predecessors. The ruling duke had made new legislation to curtail the rights of the clergy within the duchy, and against this discrimination the Pope deemed it his duty to protest. France and Naples took umbrage at what was thought to be interference on the part of the Pontiff, and demanded that he retract his censures. He refused. France thereupon seized Avignon and Venaissin, while Naples took possession of Benevento. These territories were not restored until Clement XIV actually suspended the Bull *In coena Domini.*

The breaking-out of the Revolution in 1789 brought fresh woes upon the Papacy. The shameful conduct of the renegade French bishops and clergy, their betrayal of the interests of religion to secure their temporal promotion and comfort, make a sad page of Catholic history. The *Civil Constitution of the Clergy*, passed in the National Assembly, 12 July, 1790, called forth the solemn protest of Pius VI, and as a consequence the territory of Avignon and Venaissin was annexed by the Assembly. When, in 1792 Francis II of Austria demanded the restoration of this domain he was answered by a defiant declaration of war. Readers of history are familiar with the story, during the next four years, of the terrible excesses committed by the revolutionists in the name of liberty.

On the fifth of October, 1795, Napoleon Bonaparte undertook to shape the destinies of the Republic, by driving Lepelletier and his mob followers from the streets of Paris, and taking command of the French army in Italy. His brilliant victories in rapid succession made him master of part of the papal territory, and he deemed it good policy to empty the pontifical treasury by exacting a levy of twenty-one million francs from the Pope. Early next year Pius VI was forced to sign a treaty (19 February, 1797), by which he ceded Avignon and Venaissin, Bologna, Ferrara, and Romagna to France, that is to say to the new Cisalpine Republic which had been established in northern Italy by the French government. Hardly twelve months had passed when the French General Berthier forcibly entered the papal city and by public

proclamation declared Rome a republic. The fickle Romans not merely accepted the new situation, but evinced an active partisanship against the Pope. To the honor of the people of Trastevere it is to be recorded, however, that not only did they abstain from joining in any active demonstration in favor of the party of the usurper, but they remained firmly attached to the Pope and openly declared their detestation of the French invaders. The Pontiff was made prisoner, and the French soldiers dragged him from town to town until he died at Valence, 22 August, 1799. To the last he remained unconquerable.

On the third of July, 1800, Pius VII entered Rome, the populace showing great joy and enthusiasm. Napoleon was now known as First Consul, and demanded after the battle of Marengo, that Bologna, Ferrari, Ravenna, and Forli be given up to the French. He next set about introducing Catholicity into France, and on negotiations being opened the Concordat was signed by both parties. Of Napoleon Lord Roseberry writes: "He regretted in his old days, when wearied with his disastrous struggles against the Papacy, that, instead of concluding the Concordat, he had not declared himself a Protestant. The nation would have followed him, and would have thus freed itself from the yoke of Rome." No one who really knows the character of Napoleon or the disposition of the French will endorse this view. To the French mind Protestantism offers no substitute or alternative to the Catholic religion. They will be either declared infidels or Catholics, but the national genius allows no compromise between the two extremes. On 8 May, 1804, Napoleon, having been proclaimed Emperor, desired the Pope to come to Paris and crown him. Pius VII agreed to the proposal, and on 2 December the coronation took place in Notre Dame. His duty done, the Pope set about making preparations to leave for Rome, but found that the emperor had other plans in his behalf. It was proposed to Pius VII that he transfer his residence from Rome to Paris, where he would have a portion of the city set apart for his own use, and also enjoy very

special privileges. At the same time it was quietly intimated to him that, should he show any unwillingness to comply with the emperor's proposal, force might be used to make him do so. The Pope ignored the threat and was allowed to depart. From that hour on Napoleon resolved to crush the independence of the Papacy, and he accordingly sought cause for a quarrel. The occasion arose when Pius VII refused to annul the marriage between Joseph Bonaparte, brother of Napoleon, and Miss Patterson of Baltimore. An additional source of dissatisfaction to the emperor arose from the Pontiff's ignoring the demand to order all British subjects to leave the papal territory. Napoleon showed his resentment by occupying Ancona, and annexing Porte-Corvo and Benevento, making the act doubly insulting to the Pope by giving the jurisdiction of the latter place over to Talleyrand, his minister and apostate bishop.

Under a false pretext the Pontiff was divested of his title as master of Rome, and the French peacefully obtained possession of the city. In short, Napoleon found ways and means, by the act of February, 1808, and subsequent decisions of the high courts, to divest the Pope of his dominions and to incorporate them partly in France and partly in the newly-created Kingdom of Italy. The Pope retaliated in the only way open to him, that is by issuing a Bull of excommunication against Napoleon and all who took part in the seizure of the dominions of the Church. Napoleon in turn demanded that Pius VII freely abdicate his temporal sovereignty, and, on receiving a flat refusal, the Quirinal Palace was stormed on the night of the sixth of July, 1809, by the French soldiers, headed by General Radet. To the demands of the French officer who requested the abdication the Pope replied: "Never will the emperor, from whom, after all we have done for him, we did not expect this treatment, obtain from us this dominion even though he cut our body to pieces." Banishment followed the refusal, and the Pope together with Cardinal Pacca, Secretary of State, was forced to leave the papal territory. Subsequently seized by the minions of Napoleon, the Pontiff

was imprisoned at Savona, Cardinal Pacca being banished to Fenestrelle in the Alps. By a *Senatus consultum* of 17 February, 1810, the Papal States were declared part of the French Empire. Henceforth the Holy City was to give its title no longer to the Pope but to a King of Rome subject to the Emperor of France. In the month of June 1812, the venerable prisoner was transferred to Fontainebleau where he arrived broken in spirit and in health. At the beginning of the year 1813 the emperor and empress called upon the infirm pontiff, and he was induced to sign the new Concordat lately broken by the French government. It was a step which Pius VII himself regretted afterwards and one to which he would never have agreed but that he believed the peace of the Church of France could not be secured in any other way. When Cardinal Pacca visited him later on, Pius exclaimed: "We have been dragged through the mire. The Cardinals . . . . actually dragged me to the table to affix my signature to the agreement." The emperor had pretended that the articles were only preliminary; they were nevertheless promulgated at once as the "Concordat of Fontainebleau." On the advice of Cardinal Pacca and other members of the Sacred College, Pius VII revoked this Concordat by a letter of 24 March addressed to the emperor. Early the following year negotiations were opened to satisfy the claims of the Pope by restoring part of the pontifical states to its rightful sovereign. By a decree of 18 March, 1814, the States known in the *Senatus consultum* of February, 1810, as the divisions of Rome and Trasymene, were ceded to the Holy See. The Pope was removed from Fontainebleau, and on 24 May, after four years' imprisonment, he reëntered Rome. On the fall of Napoleon the territories of the Pope were restored by the Treaty of Vienna. The portions mentioned in the treaty were the three legations, the Marches of Ancona, the Duchies of Ponte Corvo, and Benevento, but Ferrara and Comaccio, together with Piacenza, were to be garrisoned by Austria.

The pontificates of Leo XII and Gregory XVI passed by in seeming tranquillity, but the Italian revolutionists were

busy preparing for an uprising. The *Carbonari* began their work of secret agitation and combined their forces for the pretended restoration of Ferdinand of Naples. It was not long, however, before Murat was on their track, seizing numbers of them and executing the leaders. The society was reörganized and, acting with greater secrecy and caution, spread rapidly over Italy. Mazzini, who was initiated into the organization in 1828, tells of an incident when he and a number of young men in the Carbonari were severally—and unknown to each other—ordered to present themselves on the *Ponte della Mercansia* in Genoa at midnight of a certain date. They were there told that two of the number present, cloaked so as not be recognized, must then and there start for Bologna to assassinate a member of the association who had spoken against their leaders. The revolution in northern Italy, in 1830, having failed, Mazzini was arrested in Genoa and imprisoned. While confined in prison he laid plans for a new secret society, more advanced in revolutionary views and more decided in action. On his release, in 1831, he set out for Lyons, which was then the center of the revolutionary factions. They were well prepared to start the uprising, but the French government, having got word of the movement, seized the arms that had been secretly stored, and prevented the outbreak. Mazzini escaped to Corsica where the revolution had also been organized. The revolutionary Giunta at Bologna declining to aid him with funds, the movement was again frustrated. Simultaneously the insurgents were put down at Modena and at Rome, but the Duke of Modena fled and left the city at the mercy of the revolutionists. They gained a temporary success in central Italy, and Bologna now became the seat of their rule. Attacked by the Austrians, the insurgents were forced to capitulate. In the following year, however, a fresh uprising was attempted, and French treachery facilitated an attack on and seizure of the fortress of Ancona.

The association which Mazzini had planned while in prison at Savona was now organized at Marseilles, under the name

of *La Giovine Italia,* which was to effect the unity of Italy. To make propaganda for this purpose a periodical bearing the name of "Young Italy" was organized. Thus the society grew rapidly, alarming the Italian government which now adopted every means to suppress the agitation, but without avail. The first sign of activity was the proposed attempt to descend on Italy and seize Piedmont. This was in 1833. The plot having been accidentally discovered, numerous arrests followed and some of the ringleaders were executed. At Genoa the society had been scarcely broken up, when it was reorganized, and we now meet for the first time with Garibaldi as a member of *La Giovine Italia.* It was largely his activity united with that of Mazzini which led to the humiliating scenes of 1870, when Rome was finally seized by the Piedmontese.

Pius IX had been crowned Pope 21 June, 1846, and his first act was to proclaim an amnesty, 16 July, liberating those in prison and permitting the exiled to return. Perhaps it was this very generosity of a hopeful sovereign which became ultimately the means of wresting the papal dominions from their lawful representative. The Pope had cherished the thought that the amnesty would be the means of conciliating the revolutionists. That was an error. Some of the most dangerous characters, once freed from prison, made their way back to Italy and renewed on a larger scale their work of secret plotting. In a short time, as early as June of 1847, it became evident that affairs were assuming a serious aspect, and a proclamation was issued forbidding all "extraordinary manifestations" in public. The Roman revolutionists pursued the method of gathering crowds under various pretexts, delivering speeches and spreading revolutionary literature. They were putting in practice Mazzini's instruction: "Profit by the least concession to assemble the masses." The anniversary of the general amnesty was signalized by an attempt to create disturbances in Rome, by the very men who had received a free pardon the previous year. The efforts of Pius IX to counteract the current or rather to direct it by

founding a society similar to that of United Italy, under the title of an Italian League, was frustrated by the Piedmontese government. It was plain that the revolutionary movement was gaining ground in spite of the various beneficial measures adopted by the Pope and his political advisers. Several ministries of different policies succeeded each other without effecting any tangible salutary results. At length there came a crisis, in the assassination, on the fifteenth of November, of Count de Rossi, the last of Papal prime ministers. He was ascending the stairs of the Cancelleria, when he was murdered by one of the band of revolutionists who followed the dictates of Mazzini. The Italian Parliament was in session at the time, but took hardly any notice of the catastrophe, and the Civic Guard close by looked on the scene of the murder without any attempt to apprehend the murderers. Matters had evidently been concerted, for the same night the revolutionists, unmolested by the soldiers, shouted the praises of the assassin of Rossi through the streets of the city.

Shortly after these events a deputation composed of citizens and soldiers entered the Quirinal and demanded to see the Pope. Pius IX received the men, but refused to accede to any measures of force, nor was he disposed toward granting the demands of the revolutionists that he should join in a common declaration of war against Austria. He declared that as a prince of peace he could not take offensive measures by force of arms against a Christian nation. When this answer had been given, one of the deputation went out on the balcony of the Palace fronting the piazza and told the mob that the Pope refused to grant what was asked of him. A furious crowd rushed on the gates of the Palace, but were prevented by the Swiss Guard from entering. Soon the entire city was in insurrection. The Pope was given an ultimatum before the palace would be attacked. He deemed it best to yield and to appoint a new ministry which might for the moment satisfy the crowd. It was plain, however, to every one in the papal household that this condition of affairs could not last much longer, and Pius IX determined if possible to

leave the city. On the 24th of the month, accompanied by his trusted majordomo, he managed to escape, disguised as a simple priest. He was aided in this by the Bavarian Ambassador, who, being provided with passports, took the Pope in his own carriage, and saw him safely to Gaeta, under Neapolitan jurisdiction.

Meanwhile the revolutionists proceeded to depose Pius IX and on 9 February, 1849, proclaimed Rome a Republic. Church property was secularized, and clergy and religious were subjected to ignominious restrictions. For the rest, a reign of terror was organized which happily lasted only for a short time. On 3 July the revolution came to an end by the arrival of the French troops. Döllinger writes of this period: "During the sixty-nine days of the Republic created by the Garibaldists and Mazzinists, the inhabitants of the papal states must have drained to the very dregs the intoxicating cup of revolution. The birds of prey quickly gathered round the fallen body of the State, and the people were, under the name of a Democratic Republic composed of the anarchists of every country, tyrannized over and despoiled by a plundering faction. Of 'democratic speech makers,' and of empty-headed chatterers, there was a superfluity; but of all things else a deficiency."

In the meantime Cavour had added his influence to that of Mazzini and Garibaldi, in the cry for a United Italy with Rome as the center of its government. France had promised its protection to Pius IX, and he returned to the Holy City in April, 1850. This protection did not extend beyond the guarantee of certain measures for the personal safety of the Pontiff, for it was well known that Louis Napoleon was secretly assisting the revolutionists. In 1856 he and Cavour had come to a secret understanding to arouse active animosity between Sardinia and Austria. France would in that event side with the former and drive the Austrians out of Italy. Victor Emmanuel would then be declared King of Northern Italy, together with Tuscany and the surrounding country. Early in 1859 an offensive alliance was signed between the

French and Cavour, and on 29 May war was declared by the act of the Austrians crossing the Ticino. An invasion of papal territory by the Piedmontese took place in 1860, and the Swiss soldiers were treacherously assailed while negotiations for peace were going on. Later, in 1867, Garibaldi marched on Rome, but he was arrested by Piedmontese authorities and confined in the fortress of Alessandria.

It should be mentioned here that in 1864, a treaty had been concluded between Victor Emmanuel and Louis Napoleon refusing to countenance any further incursions into the papal territories. This the King of Italy pledged himself to see maintained. It did not, however, prevent the Piedmontese government from fomenting a general feeling thoroughly antagonistic to religion and the papacy. Among those who at the time raised their voices against this spirit was Archbishop Pecci, of Perugia, subsequently known as Leo XIII.

The outburst of the Franco-Prussian War sealed the fate of the States of the Church by giving a pretext to Napoleon for withdrawing his troops from Rome, where they had served the Pope as a garrison of protection. Victor Emmanuel seized the opportunity and ordered his soldiers to move against Rome. The city was besieged and on the twentieth of September, 1870, the breach of Porta Pia opened the way for the entry of the Piedmontese troops.

The enemies of the Church were satisfied. Rome had fallen and it would follow that the papacy must expire. Yet not so. Though the temporal power was taken away, there remained what must ever be the soul of the papal power, the influence and voice of the successor of the Prince of the Apostles, the Vicar of Christ. That influence will never be wrested from the Pope, for the Eternal Truth has said it: "Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram aedificabo ecclesiam meam, et portae inferi non praevalebunt adversus eam."

EDWARD F. CURRAN.

Pouchcove, Newfoundland.

Analecta.

E. S. CONGREGATIONE CONCILII.

DECRETUM DE SPONSALIBUS ET MATRIMONIO IUSSU ET AUCTORITATE SS. D. N. PII PAPAE X A S. CONGREGATIONE CONCILII EDITUM.

Ne temere inirentur clandestina coniugia, quae Dei Ecclesia iustissimis de causis semper detestata est atque prohibuit, provide cavit Tridentinum Concilium, *cap. 1, Sess. XXIV de reform. matrim.* edicens: "Qui aliter quam praesente parocho vel alio sacerdote de ipsius parochi seu Ordinarii licentia et duobus vel tribus testibus matrimonium contrahere attentabunt, eos Sancta Synodus ad sic contrahendum omnino inhabiles reddit, et huiusmodi contractus irritos et nullos esse decernit."

Sed cum idem Sacrum Concilium praecepisset, ut tale decretum publicaretur in singulis paroeciis, nec vim haberet nisi iis in locis ubi esset promulgatum; accidit ut plura loca, in quibus publicatio illa facta non fuit, beneficio tridentinae legis caruerint, hodieque careant, et haesitationibus atque incommodis veteris disciplinae adhuc obnoxia maneant.

Verum nec ubi viguit nova lex, sublata est omnis difficultas. Saepe namque gravis exstitit dubitatio in decernenda persona parochi, quo praesente matrimonium sit contrahendum. Statuit quidem canonica disciplina, proprum parochum eum

intelligi debere, cuius in paroecia domicilium sit, aut quasi domicilium alterutrius contrahentis. Verum quia nonnunquam difficile est iudicare, certo ne constet de quasi-domicilio, haud pauca matrimonia fuerunt obiecta periculo ne nulla essent: multa quoque, sive inscitia hominum sive fraude, illegitima prorsus atque irrita deprehensa sunt.

Haec dudum deplorata, eo crebrius accidere nostra aetate videmus, quo facilius ac celerius commeatus cum gentibus, etiam disiunctissimis, perficiuntur. Quamobrem sapientibus viris ac doctissimis visum est expedire ut mutatio aliqua induceretur in iure circa formam celebrandi connubii. Complures etiam sacrorum Antistites omni ex parte terrarum, praesertim e celebrioribus civitatibus, ubi gravior appareret necessitas, supplices ad id preces Apostolicae Sedi admoverunt.

Flagitatum simul est ab Episcopis, tum Europae plerisque, tum aliarum regionum, ut incommodis occurreretur, quae ex sponsalibus, idest mutuis promissionibus futuri matrimonii privatim initis, derivantur. Docuit enim experientia satis, quae secum pericula ferant eiusmodi sponsalia: primum quidem incitamenta peccandi causamque cur inexpertae puellae decipiantur; postea dissidia ac lites inextricabiles.

His rerum adiunctis permotus SSmus D. N. Pius PP. X pro ea quam gerit omnium Ecclesiarum sollicitudine, cupiens ad memorata damna et pericula removenda temperatione aliqua uti, commissit S. Congregationi Concilii ut de hac re videret, et quae opportuna aestimaret, Sibi proponeret.

Voluit etiam votum audire Consilii ad ius canonicum in unum redigendum constituti, nec non Emorum Cardinalium qui pro eodem codice parando speciali commissione delecti sunt: a quibus, quemadmodum et a S. Congregatione Concilii, conventus in eum finem saepius habiti sunt. Omnium autem sententiis obtentis, SSmus Dominus S. Congregationi Concilii mandavit, ut decretum ederet quo leges a Se, ex certa scientia et matura deliberatione probatae, continerentur, quibus sponsalium et matrimonii disciplina in posterum regeretur, eorumque celebratio expedita, certa atque ordinata fieret.

In executionem itaque Apostolici mandati S. Concilii Congregatio praesentibus litteris constituit atque decernit ea quae sequuntur.

De sponsalibus.

I.—Ea tantum sponsalia habentur valida et canonicos sortiuntur effectus, quae contracta fuerint per scripturam subsignatam a partibus et vel a parocho, aut a loci Ordinario, vel saltem a duobus testibus.

Quod si utraque vel alterutra pars scribere nesciat, id in ipsa scriptura adnotetur; et alius testis addatur, qui cum parocho, aut loci Ordinario, vel duobus testibus, de quibus supra, scripturam subsignet.

II.—Nomine parochi hic et in sequentibus articulis venit non solum qui legitime praeest paroeciae canonice erectae; sed in regionibus, ubi paroeciae canonice erectae non sunt, etiam sacerdos cui in aliquo definito territorio cura animarum legitime commissa est, et parocho aequiparatur; et in missionibus, ubi territoria necdum perfecte divisa sunt, omnis sacerdos a missionis Moderatore ad animarum curam in aliqua statione universaliter deputatus.

De matrimonio.

III.—Ea tantum matrimonia valida sunt, quae contrahuntur coram parocho vel loci Ordinario vel sacerdote ab alterutro delegato, et duobus saltem testibus, iuxta tamen regulas in sequentibus articulis expressas, et salvis exceptionibus quae infra n. VII et VIII ponuntur.

IV.—Parochus et loci Ordinarius valide matrimonio adsistunt,

§ 1.° a die tantummodo adeptae possessionis beneficii vel initi officii, nisi publico decreto nominatim fuerint excommunicati vel ab officio suspensi;

§ 2.° intra limites dumtaxat sui territorii: in quo matrimoniis nedum suorum subditorum, sed etiam non subditorum valide adsistunt;

§ 3.° dummodo invitati ac rogati, et neque vi neque metu gravi constricti requirant excipiantque contrahentium consensum.

V.—Licite autem adsistunt,

§ 1.° constito sibi legitime de libero statu contrahentium, servatis de iure servandis;

§ 2.° constito insuper de domicilio, vel saltem de menstrua commoratione alterutrius contrahentis in loco matrimonii;

§ 3.° quod si deficiat, ut parochus et loci Ordinarius licite matrimonio adsint, indigent licentia parochi vel Ordinarii proprii alterutrius contrahentis, nisi gravis intercedat necessitas, quae ab ea excuset.

§ 4.° Quoad *vagos*, extra casum necessitatis parocho ne liceat eorum matrimoniis adsistere, nisi re ad Ordinarium vel ad sacerdotem ab eo delegatum delata, licentiam adsistendi impetraverit.

§ 5.° In quolibet autem casu pro regula habeatur, ut matrimonium coram sponsae parocho celebretur, nisi aliqua iusta causa excuset.

VI.—Parochus et loci Ordinarius licentiam concedere possunt alio sacerdoti determinato ac certo, ut matrimoniis intra limites sui territorii adsistat.

Delegatus autem, ut valide et licite adsistat, servare tenetur limites mandati, et regulas pro parocho et loci Ordinario n. IV et V superius statutas.

VII.—Imminente mortis periculo, ubi parochus, vel loci Ordinarius, vel sacerdos ab alterutro delegatus, haberi nequeat, ad consulendum conscientiae et (si casus ferat) legitimationi prolis, matrimonium contrahi valide ac licite potest coram quolibet sacerdote et duobus testibus.

VIII.—Si contingat ut in aliqua regione parochus locive Ordinarius, aut sacerdos ab eis delegatus, coram quo matrimonium celebrari queat, haberi non possit, eaque rerum conditio a mense iam perseveret, matrimonium valide ac licite iniri potest emisso a sponsis formali consensu coram duobus testibus.

IX.—§ 1.° Celebrato matrimonio, parochus, vel qui eius vices gerit, statim describat in libro matrimoniorum nomina coniugum ac testium, locum et diem celebrati matrimonii, atque alia, iuxta modum in libris ritualibus vel a proprio Ordinario praescriptum; idque licet alius sacerdos vel a se vel ab Ordinario delegatus matrimonio adstiterit.

§ 2.° Praeterea parochus in libro quoque baptizatorum adnotet, coniugem tali die in sua parochia matrimonium contraxisse. Quod si coniux alibi baptizatus fuerit, matrimonii paro-

chus notitiam initi contractus ad parochum baptismi sive per se, sive per curiam episcopalem transmittat, ut matrimonium in baptismi librum referatur.

§ 3.° Quoties matrimonium ad normam n. VII aut VIII contrahitur, sacerdos in priori casu, testes in altero, tenentur in solidum cum contrahentibus curare, ut initum coniugium in praescriptis libris quam primum adnotetur.

X.—Parochi qui heic hactenus praescripta violaverint, ab Ordinariis pro modo et gravitate culpae puniantur. Et insuper si alicuius matrimonio adstiterint contra praescriptum § 2i et 3i num. V, emolumenta *stolae* sua ne faciant, sed proprio contrahentium parocho remittant.

XI.—§ 1.° Statutis superius legibus tenentur omnes in catholica Ecclesia baptizati et ad eam ex haeresi aut schismate conversi (licet sive hi, sive illi ab eadem postea defecerint), quoties inter se sponsalia vel matrimonium ineant.

§ 2.° Vigent quoque pro iisdem de quibus supra catholicis, si cum acatholicis sive baptizatis, sive non baptizatis, etiam post obtentam dispensationem ab impedimento mixtae religionis vel disparitatis cultus, sponsalia vel matrimonium contrahunt; nisi pro aliquo particulari loco aut regione aliter a S. Sede sit statutum.

§ 3.° Acatholici sive baptizati sive non baptizati, si inter se contrahunt, nullibi ligantur ad catholicam sponsalium vel matrimonii formam servandam.

Praesens decretum legitime publicatum et promulgatum habeatur per eius transmissionem ad locorum Ordinarios; et quae in eo disposita sunt ubique vim legis habere incipiant a die solemni Paschae Resurrectionis D. N. I. C. proximi anni 1908.

Interim vero omnes locorum Ordinarii curent hoc decretum quamprimum in vulgus edi, et in singulis suarum dioecesum parochialibus ecclesiis explicari ut ab omnibus rite cognoscatur.

Praesentibus valituris de mandato speciali SSmi D. N. Pii PP. X, contrariis quibuslibet etiam peculiari mentione dignis minime obstantibus.

Datum Romae die 2a mensis Augusti anni 1907.

✠ Vincentius Card. Ep. Praenest., *Praefectus.*

C. De Lai, *Secretarius.*

Studies and Conferences.

OUR ANALECTA.

The Roman document for the month is:

S. CONGREGATION OF THE COUNCIL promulgates the new laws, to go into effect next Easter, for the universal Church, regarding marriage and betrothal. This decree is discussed in the CONFERENCES (below).

THE NEW MARRIAGE LAWS.

On Easter Sunday, 19 April, of the coming year, 1908, the regulations, published in the *Analecta* of this number of the REVIEW, concerning the validity of marriage contracts among Catholics, go into actual force and become the universal law of the Church.

All the Ordinaries of the different dioceses are separately instructed to see that the decree be duly published and explained to the faithful in the parish churches of their respective jurisdictions. Hence the plea of non-promulgation, which has been applied to the *Tametsi* and other pontifical legislation, cannot be invoked in respect of this new decree under any circumstances after next Easter. No doubt the Pastoral Letters usually issued at the beginning of Lent will for the most part deal with this subject, so as to instruct the faithful upon all the important points of the law.

Some of the provisions set forth in the decree affect the laity in a way which makes it especially important and a matter of justice to them that they should know its obligations. These are chiefly:

That promises of marriage or so-called "engagements" are recognized by the authorities of the Church, or in an ecclesiastical court of appeal, only when they have been made with due consideration and solemnity on both sides, that is to say, by written contract, signed not only by the two parties who

make the engagement (or, in case they are unable to write their signatures, by a duly qualified substitute), but also by an authorized priest, or by the Ordinary of the place in which the parties reside; or at least by two trustworthy witnesses.

The new law in this matter comes as a precaution against rash, deceptive, or forced engagements to marriage. It does not mean that Catholics are to be prevented from marrying before a priest unless they have made a previous written engagement before witnesses. But it means that engagements of marriage would not be sustained in an ecclesiastical tribunal in cases where one party lodges an appeal of breach of promise, or when there is question of annulling impediment to actual marriage with another party, unless such promise can be proved to have been serious and legitimate by having been made in writing duly attested by witnesses.

The legislation on this point is not altogether new. It has been in force in the Spanish countries since 1880, and was incorporated in the Decrees of the recent Plenary Council of Latin America, held in 1899.[1] It is to prevent rash promises. To be well informed on this subject is of advantage to both the moral training and social uplifting of our young people. It will elevate their estimate of the importance of the marriage contract and strengthen the serious obligations which are therein made. It will counteract the frivolous rashness which, prompted by momentary infatuation, forges pledges that end in unhappy unions, the destruction of family life and of motherhood, and the lowering of the standard of home education. Young men and women will learn to heed the German poet's admonition:

[1] Patribus Concilii Plenarii expedire visum fuit, a SS. D. N. Leone PP. XIII postulare extensionem ad Americam Latinam declarationis S. C. Concilii pro Hispania ed. d. 31 Jan. 1880, ideoque: Sponsalia quae contrahuntur in regionibus nostris absque publica scriptura invalida esse, et publicam scripturam supplere non posse informationem matrimonialem, neque instrumentum in Curia dioecesana vel alibi conflatum pro dispensatione super aliquo impedimento, ex quo inferri possit promissio serio facta contrahendi matrimonium.—*Conc. Plen. Americ. Latinae*, art. 592, n. 1.

Make then your pledges firm and strong,
You who join hands in endless union;
Let heart with heart be in communion;
For fancy flies—regret lasts long.
Mere passion will fly,
Only love can endure:
The flower will die
Ere the fruit can mature.

Another point of importance about which the people need to be informed is the requisite of domicile. In this matter it suffices that at least one of the parties shall have lived for one month in the parish or locality where the marriage is to take place. The rule is, moreover, that the marriage take place before the parish priest of the bride. If the marriage is celebrated in a place where neither party has a domicile (not even for a month), the priest who witnesses the marriage must have previously obtained the permission of the parish priest or the Ordinary of at least one of the parties. Only grave necessity dispenses from this formality.

As regards the first point, that of residence, the new law permits a priest to marry persons after he has "ascertained that one of the contracting parties has a domicile or at least has lived for a month in the place where the marriage takes place." If this condition be lacking, the parish priest and the Ordinary of the place, to assist licitly at a marriage, require the permission of the parish priest or the Ordinary of one of the contracting parties, unless it be a case of grave necessity, which excuses from this permission.

As regards persons without fixed abode (*vagi*)—except in case of necessity, it is not lawful for a parish priest to assist at their marriage until he has reported the matter to the Ordinary and obtained permission to assist.

In every case it is to be held as the rule that the marriage is to be celebrated before the parish priest of the bride, unless some just cause excuses from this.

There are conditions also when Catholics may legitimately contract marriage without the presence of the parish priest or indeed of any priest, though not without other witnesses

(two). The cases are comprised in the two following paragraphs:

When danger of death is imminent and where the parish priest or the Ordinary of the place, or a priest delegated by either of these, cannot be had, in order to provide for the relief of conscience and (should the case require it) for the legitimation of offspring, marriage may be contracted validly and licitly before any priest and two witnesses.

If it happen that in any district the parish priest or the Ordinary of the place, or a priest delegated by either of them, before whom marriage can be celebrated, is not to be had, and that this condition of things has lasted for a month, marriage may be validly and licitly entered upon by the formal declaration of consent made by the spouses in the presence of two witnesses.

Another feature of the new legislation which implies a real departure and imposes definite obligations, according to circumstances, not only on the priest who witnesses the marriage, but also on the contracting parties themselves, is the duty of registering the marriage, not only in the customary Book of Marriages, but also in the Baptismal Records of the parish of the married couple.

This obligation will probably meet with some demurring on the part of those who are not accustomed to place much importance in official detail. The easy methods which pastoral life is apt to foster, make us forget that an exact entry system in an organized society, such as the diocesan administration represents in the Church, is of immense service both as a discipline and as a check on abuses of carelessness or forgetfulness. We need an improved curial system, to allow better episcopal supervision of and insight into parish affairs. The episcopal visitations are in many cases mere perfunctory incidents in the annual rounds of the Ordinary, during which Confirmation and a festive reception on the part of parish clergy and people form the leading features. If we look a moment into the system of supervision which the Civil Service authorities and the War Department exercise in maintain-

ing proper control over and order in their affairs, we may realize what a perfectly equipped diocesan office means. If the clergy exercised a tithe of the care (and the Catholic system of local discipline and interdiocesan communication would facilitate it so much) which we find taken in any other successful organizations, whether secular or religious, we should have easy work in extending the glory and power of the Catholic Church.

We add the remaining points of the new legislation, hoping in the course of subsequent issues to discuss one or other of such of them as involve perhaps some difficulty in practical application. Touching the subject of registry the decree makes the following prescriptions:

After the celebration of a marriage the parish priest or he who takes his place is to write at once in the Book of Marriages the names of the couple and of the witnesses, the place and day of the celebration of the marriage, and the other details, according to the method prescribed in the ritual books or by the Ordinary; and this even when another priest, delegated either by the parish priest himself or by the Ordinary, has assisted at the marriage.

Moreover, the parish priest is to note also in the Book of Baptisms that the married person contracted marriage on such a day in his parish. If the married person has been baptized elsewhere, the parish priest who has assisted at the marriage is to transmit, either directly or through the episcopal curia, the announcement of the marriage that has taken place, to the parish priest of the place where the person was baptized, in order that the marriage may be inscribed in the baptismal register.

Whenever a marriage is contracted at the death-bed of one of the parties, or on other occasions when only lay witnesses assist, as provided in the new law, the priest in the former case, the witnesses in the latter, are bound conjointly with the contracting parties to provide that the marriage be inscribed as soon as possible in the prescribed books.

The binding force of these laws is further emphasized in the following words:

Parish priests who violate the rules thus far laid down are to

be punished by their Ordinaries according to the nature and gravity of their transgression. Moreover, if they assist at the marriage of anybody in violation of the rules laid down in 2 and 3 of No. V, they are not to appropriate the stole-fees, but must remit them to the parish priest of the contracting parties.

The above laws are binding on all persons baptized in the Catholic Church and on those who have been converted to it from heresy or schism (even when either the latter or the former have fallen away afterwards from the Church) whenever they contract *sponsalia* or marriage with one another.

The same laws are binding also on the same Catholics as above if they contract *sponsalia* or marriage with non-Catholics, baptized or unbaptized, even after a dispensation has been obtained from the impediment ***mixtae religionis*** or ***disparitatis cultus;*** unless the Holy See decree otherwise for some particular place or region.

Non-Catholics, whether baptized or unbaptized, who contract among themselves are nowhere bound to observe the Catholic form of *sponsalia* or marriage.

THE DECREE, "NE TEMERE," ON MARRIAGE AND BETROTHALS.

(*Communicated.*)

The late decree, *Ne Temere,* treating of marriage and betrothals, and issuing from the Congregation of the Council, August, 1907, extends, with certain modifications, the *Tametsi* decree of the Council of Trent, to the entire Church. The *Ne Temere* is universal in its application as well as in its intent.

The Tridentine law concerning marriage requires that all marriages be contracted in the presence of the parish priest, or of the Ordinary of the diocese, or at least in the presence of another priest duly authorized by either the parish priest or the Ordinary, and that, besides, in every case there be two or three witnesses to the marriage. All marriages between baptized persons, contracted where the *Tametsi* is published, if they come under the law, are null and void, unless the Tridentine law be observed.

According to the last decree, only those marriages are valid

which are contracted before the parish priest or the Ordinary of the place, or another priest duly authorized by one of these, and in every case with at least two witnesses present.

So far the two decrees seem to agree; but very naturally there are provisions in the one last issued that modify the *Tametsi* in many important particulars.

The *Tametsi,* in order to be in force, must be promulgated in each single parish. The *Ne Temere* is promulgated by a single act, and will be in force throughout the entire Church after Easter Sunday of 1908.

The present decree is personal, and not territorial. One result of this provision is that non-Catholics when contracting *sponsalia,* or marriage, are in no way bound by the law. Another result follows from this provision, as I take it, namely, that all marriages celebrated between persons coming from a different territory are valid, even though in certain cases they may be unlawful.

It is well known that heretofore all baptized persons in regions where the *Tametsi* was published, were *per se* bound by the law. Obviously in many places, as for example in Holland, a dispensation was granted, relieving baptized non-Catholics from the effects of the law of clandestinity.

Although non-Catholics, when they contract *sponsalia,* or marriage, among themselves, are not bound by the law, and their marriages are not affected by it, yet when one of the contracting parties is a Catholic, that is, in every case of a mixed marriage, whether the impediment be diriment or impedient, and whether a dispensation has been already granted or not, the provisions of the *Ne Temere* must be observed for the validity of the marriage. Mixed marriages, just as the marriage of Catholics before a civil magistrate or before the minister of any sect, will, after Easter Sunday next, be null and void.

In order to extend the law of clandestinity to the universal Church, it was necessary to modify the meaning of the term parish priest as contemplated in the *Tametsi* decree. This has been done by constituting every priest in possession of a

parish, whether canonically erected or not, or any priest in charge of souls in a certain territory, an authorized witness to assist at a marriage, and he may lawfully delegate another priest to assist at any marriage at which he himself might assist.

It is worthy of note that, whereas at present the custom prevails of allowing the marriage to take place before the parish priest of either the bride or the bridegroom, accordingly as they may agree between themselves, henceforth, when the new law goes into effect, it is the parish priest of the bride who will be the authorized witness.

A twofold record of all marriages will hereafter be required. To the usual marriage record as it has been kept in the past, there is added a record to be entered in the Book of Baptisms. Opposite the names of the parties married, as they appear in the Book of Baptisms, there must be entered in some convenient form a record of their marriage.

It may be noticed in passing that this last provision of the new law will give rise to considerable difficulty. If the parties contract marriage in the parish where they were baptized and where the record of their baptism is found, the new record may easily be made; but as it frequently happens that the parties were baptized elsewhere, it will often be difficult to locate their baptismal record.

The decree *Ne Temere* treats likewise of betrothals, or *sponsalia,* and it applies, like the part that relates to marriage, to all cases where either one or both the contracting parties are Catholics. Hereafter, *sponsalia* in order to be sustained by the Church and in order to produce those effects that flow from valid *sponsalia,* must be entered into in writing, and the agreement must be signed by both the contracting parties, by the priest who assists, or, in his stead, if no priest be present as witness, by two witnesses.

It would appear that this promise of marriage, having been duly executed, as provided above, is to be kept in the custody of the parish priest who witnesses the agreement.

Of course it is understood that, whenever there is question

of a parish priest acting as witness to a marriage or to a promise of marriage, the Ordinary may act in the same capacity, in the case of any person belonging to his diocese.

Finally, the decree *Ne Temere* possesses all the merits of the *Tametsi*. It has the additional merit, however, of being definite in regard to its promulgation, and in exempting baptized non-Catholics from its provisions, as well as making clear the status of mixed marriages.

No doubt the result of this new decree will be to lessen the number of hasty and inconsiderate marriages and betrothals. It will also arrest the evident lack of reverence for the Sacrament of Marriage which is rapidly spreading on all sides at the present time.

St. Paul, Minnesota. P. R. HEFFRON.

INVALID APPOINTMENTS TO IRREMOVABLE RECTORSHIPS?

Qu. Ten years ago a number of churches in this diocese were designated as irremovable rectorships. When some of these rectorships became vacant by the death of the original incumbents, new rectors were assigned after the usual method of examination held by the synodal examiners. These had been appointed by the Ordinary, and informed of their appointment by letter, but without being required to go through the formality of taking the prescribed oath. The question was raised by one or two of the examiners as to the legality of their appointment, but it was generally supposed that the bishop could dispense from such formalities. Lately the matter has come up for discussion in a private conference of some of the clergy, and very decided doubts were expressed regarding the validity of the appointments made under a board of examiners none of whom took the required oath mentioned in the Council of Baltimore (I am sure at least some of them were never asked to take it). Tit. II, Cap. III, n. 26. What does the REVIEW say regarding the validity of the appointments made under the above conditions?

Resp. The Council of Trent, to which the sanction for the legislation on the subject of synodal examinations for irremovable rectorships is to be referred, distinctly requires the oath from each and all of those who act as synodal examiners.

"Omnes examinatores jurent ad sancta Dei evangelia, se, quacumque humana affectione postposita, fideliter munus executuros." (Conc. Trid. Sess. 24, C. 18.)

That this oath is an essential requisite of qualification for acting as examiner will hardly be questioned. Without it the validity of the testimony of the examiners lacks canonical sanction, and this renders the whole process of the prescribed concursus null and void. St. Pius V in his Constitution "In conferendis" is very decided on this point when he writes: "Per adjectam clausulam irritantem nullus et irritus declaratur Concursus, si in eo neglecta fuerit *forma Concilii Tridentini*, Sess. 24, C. 18. Forma ergo Tridentina ut substantialis habenda est."

Even if only one of the examiners holding the concursus be canonically disqualified from membership in the synodal board, it would suffice to render all the proceedings null and void. "Concursus *est nullus* in quo cum examinatoribus synodalibus alius intervenit, qui non erat de Synodalibus, isque examinavit." (S. C. C., 9 September, 1628.)

It would follow, then, that the vacancies of irremovable rectorships filled under the above-mentioned conditions are still open, and that the rectors in charge hold their positions only temporarily, by appointment, until the regular synodal examining board presents candidates properly qualified from whose number the Ordinary may select.

MASS STIPENDS SENT OUT OF THE DIOCESE.

(*Communicated.*)

In the August number of the REVIEW the Decree of 22 May, 1907, touching the subject of Mass stipends, was discussed, the writer taking the following passages as a summary of the prescriptions of the S. Congregation for the future.

1. That Mass stipends are not to be given to priests of another diocese, whether they be religious or seculars, except with the explicit sanction of the Ordinary or the Provincial. The words of the Decree make the Ordinary practically the dispenser of all the stipends given to priests under his jurisdiction.

2. The Ordinary of each diocese is to keep a register of the names of

his priests, and in it are to be noted the Masses assigned to each through or by the Ordinary.

3. Lest, however, these restrictions prevent the exercise of that charity by which the priests of the foreign missions in the East have hitherto become beneficiaries of the generosity of the well-to-do Catholics among the clergy and laity, the S. Congregation of Propaganda is constituted the official depositary of all offerings for Masses intended for the Oriental missions. Hence those who wish to aid priests in the foreign missions by offerings for Masses shall have to send the stipends directly to the S. Congregation in Rome, whence they will be distributed according to the known needs of the respective missions.

Although a careful and perhaps repeated reading of the above passages may make the matter clear and unmistakable, I believe that more than one reader is apt to understand the first of the above statements to mean that a priest may not hereafter transfer a Mass stipend to a priest of another diocese without having previously obtained permission from his *own* Ordinary or Provincial; the permission, namely, of the Ordinary or Provincial *of the one who sends the stipend.*

Again, according to No. 3, both *clergy* and *laity* are forbidden in future to send stipends to the East, unless they make the S. Congregation of the Propaganda depositary of said stipends.

May I presume to take exception to these statements and to set forth the matter in somewhat clearer terms? The basis of my assertions will be the Latin text of the Decree of 22 May, 1907, and its interpretation as found in the *Nouvelle Revue Théologique,* pp. 436 ff. of August of this year.

In the first place, the Decree does *not* say "loci Ordinarium," but "eorum Ordinarium." Now we know how technical terms are used in Roman documents. Hence it is clear that not the Ordinary of the priest (or person) *sending* the stipend, but the Ordinary of the *receiver* or *celebrant* is the one the Decree has in view.

Again, by *Ordinary* is meant Bishop and Vicar General for the secular Clergy, and by Provincial is meant the Provincial strictly so-called, or even local superior, but who would have jurisdiction in *foro externo.*

Moreover, the *Revue* goes on to state that, until the matter be *authoritatively* cleared up, the word "committere" (given

an official charge) supposes that the person *sending* the stipend be *himself responsible* for the saying of the Mass; consequently this would exclude, for the time being at least, the faithful or laity generally.

Further, although in the case of priests and others *responsible* for the celebration of Masses, permission should be had either from the Ordinary (or Provincial) himself or through an *intermediary,* yet such an Ordinary may not *arbitrarily refuse* said permission, but only in the case where the proposed celebrant could not or would not satisfy the conditions laid down in the Decree "Ut Debita," 11 May, 1904.

With the exception of the case (Article 4, of the Decree "Ut Debita") wherein it is stated that priests must send to *their* Ordinary at the end of the year Masses which have remained unsaid for the time mentioned in the decree, the Ordinaries may *not* profit of the present legislation to *prevent* priests or lay people sending Masses out of the diocese.

Of course such priests take upon themselves the *responsibility* of the celebration of Masses thus sent away and are answerable before God and the Church ("Ut Debita") for the acquittal of that obligation, whereas, had they sent them to the Ordinary, they would be freed from *every* obligation ("Ut Debita," Article VI).

Again, there is mention in No. 3, page 193 of the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW (August, 1907), of *clergy* and *laity.* The reference to the laity is clearly an oversight, and notwithstanding the defense put up in the REVIEW (otherwise a very wise and useful counsel) for the *laity* not sending Masses to the *East,* except through the S. Congregation of the Propaganda, yet, not to be "more Catholic than the Pope," we must *not* urge the *present Decree,* in favor of the laity so doing—as a decree, I mean. The words of the Decree are explicit: "Si qui vel *Episcopi* vel *Sacerdotes,*" and not "fideles." Hence the *Revue* is right in saying that only bishops and priests are bound by this article of the Decree. Nay more, even *they* are bound *strictly* only for the Masses mentioned in Articles 5 and 7 of the Decree "Ut Debita" (1904).

Finally, until more light shall have been thrown on this

subject, it may be held, with the celebrated Father Ferreres, S. J., (*Razon y Fe*, August, 1907), and the *Revue*, that the new Decree does not take away from Regular Prelates their right to *receive* stipends from the faithful *for* their religious missionaries in the East under *their jurisdiction*, nor the right *to send* such stipends *to* those missionaries.

Still, as the REVIEW justly remarks, every precaution against fraud should be taken. We have been speaking only of the *meaning* and *extent* of the Decree. Let us hope that some doubts have been cleared away.

WILLIAM F. GAGNIEUR, S. J.

Sault Ste Marie, Mich.

THE BREVIARY AND HISTORICAL CRITICISM.

Qu. It is beyond doubt, as the writer in the September number of the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW says, that many Offices, the Presentation, the Rosary, Mt. Carmel, Holy House of Loretto, Our Lady of the Snows, cannot stand in the light of modern criticism. Why, then, do priests say these Offices? What is the obligation in the circumstances? Would he commit sin by passing them by? Does he commit sin by reciting them and thus, with the approbation of the Church (for he prays in her name), giving his coöperation to the extension of a long list of pseudo-legends, etc., etc.? Could you deal with this matter in your next issue—as it is discussed largely amongst the clergy, and many do not know where they stand in so important a matter, involving, as it does, peace of conscience? J. O.

Resp. The obligation of doing a thing prescribed by authority is quite distinct and independent from the consent of the mind to the truth and expediency of the thing to be done. We recite the Offices and lessons referred to without passing judgment on their historical truth or accuracy or utility, except in so far as they express the devout faith of thousands of Catholics whose reverence we might well imitate, whether we believe the nocturns to relate facts or only legends. Most of us learn more solid and lasting truth from legends in our days of innocence than ever, at a later age, we learn from the teachings of science.

Ecclesiastical Library Table.

SACRED SCRIPTURE.

Recent Decision of the Biblical Commission on the Fourth Gospel.

THUS far the Biblical Commission has issued only four decisions: on 13 February, 1905, it admitted the fallibility of the so-called implicit or tacit quotations, i. e. of those Biblical passages which can be solidly proved to have been copied from other sources by the inspired writer without either making them his own or guaranteeing them by his authority. Again, 23 June, 1905, the Commission allowed the commentator to abandon the historical sense in those books or passages of the Bible in which it can be proved by solid argument, without opposing the sense or judgment of the Church, that the inspired writer did not intend to convey a strictly historical meaning. Thirdly, 27 June, 1906, the same Commission decided that the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch has not as yet been disproved by the arguments of the critics, though the Mosaic authorship does not imply that Moses either wrote the whole of the Pentateuch with his own hand or dictated it to his secretaries, nor that Moses abstained from the use of written or unwritten sources, nor again that the text of the Pentateuch may not have been modified by later inspired writers or may not have suffered minor accidental changes or corruptions.

The unbiased reader will easily admit that these three decisions favor the conservative Bible students rather than the progressive. Even the most noted conservative commentators always admitted the fallible character of passages that were merely quoted by the sacred writer without being made his own; they admitted the non-historical character of books or passages of the Bible which the inspired writer did not intend in an historical sense; finally, they were content with the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch in its wider sense, though they maintained that the critical arguments against it were inconclusive. Consequently, it was not the conservative views

on the foregoing questions that elicited the first three decisions of the Biblical Commission. If there had not been a tendency on the part of the progressive scholars to exceed the limits, there would have been no call for these three decisions.

The same must be said with regard to the fourth decree, dated 29 May, 1907. Probably at no previous time had the Fourth Gospel occupied the attention of the learned world so generally as it did in the second half of the past century. It was not the book as such that excited this lively interest; the critics saw clearly that the Johannine problem is closely connected with the question, "What think you of Christ?" Not that the Fourth Gospel differed from the synoptists in its teaching concerning the person of Christ; but the critics believed that the Fourth Gospel teaches clearly and distinctly what the first three Gospels teach obscurely or not at all. By undermining the authority of the Fourth Gospel many believed they could shake the proof for the Divinity of Jesus Christ. Hence the importance of the questions: Who wrote the Fourth Gospel, and what is its historical value?

Until the end of the eighteenth century no one denied that the Apostle St. John wrote the Fourth Gospel, except the Alogi. Evanson denied its authenticity in 1792, and he was followed by a few stray scholars only, till Bretschneider in 1820 inaugurated a permanent school of opposition. Since then the subject has been a constant topic of discussion. In our own day the greater number of Protestant writers follow Harnack, Holtzmann, and Jülicher in their negative attitude toward authenticity of the Fourth Gospel, while the conservative wing of Protestant scholars follow the leadership of Bernard Weiss and Theodore Zahn. Among Catholics the Abbé Loisy has found some followers in the opinion that the Fourth Gospel has been written by an author belonging to the third Christian generation, i. e. by a writer who was neither an Apostle nor a disciple of the Apostles.

From a theological point of view, it can hardly be maintained that the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel is an article of faith. At the same time, it is certain that an apostolical origin is a necessary prerequisite in order that a book may be

considered as part of the New Testament Canon. For the inspiration of the New Testament Books is a fact known by Christian revelation, and Christian revelation was completed in the apostolic age. The apostolic origin of the Fourth Gospel, or its composition by a writer of the apostolic age, is therefore a fact inseparably and intimately connected with an article of faith, or a so-called *dogmatic fact.* It is not surprising, therefore, that the Biblical Commission has seen good reason for issuing a declaration bearing on the authorship and the historical character of the Fourth Gospel.

"To the proposed doubts that follow, the Pontifical Commission *De Re Biblica* has answered in the following manner. Doubt I. Whether from the constant, universal, and solemn tradition of the Church coming down from the second century, as it is gathered chiefly: [*a*] from the testimonies and allusions of the Holy Fathers and ecclesiastical writers, nay even those of heretics, which since they must have been derived from the disciples or first successors of the Apostles, are joined by a necessary connexion to the very origin of the book; [*b*] from the fact that the name of the author of the Fourth Gospel was received always and everywhere in the canons and catalogues of the Sacred Books; [*c*] from the most ancient manuscript codices of the same Books and their versions in various languages; [*d*] from the public liturgical use obtaining throughout the whole world from the very beginnings of the Church; leaving aside the theological argument, it is proved by such a solid historical argument that the Apostle John and no other must be acknowledged as the author of the Fourth Gospel, that the reasons to the contrary brought forward by the critics in no wise weaken this tradition? Answer. Affirmatively."

In other words, the Biblical Commission decides that the argument from external evidence for the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel is valid. If we omit in this argument the testimony more recent than the second century, it can still be proved historically that the Fourth Gospel was acknowledged in the Church toward the end of the second century as being of Johannine origin. Clement of Alexandria, the dis-

ciple of Pantænus and master of Origen, bears witness for the Alexandrian Church; Theophilus of Antioch, the bishop of that Church after 169 A. D., represents its teaching concerning the Johannine authorship of the last Gospel; Tertullian voices the belief of the African Church in the same tradition; the Muratorian fragment bears testimony that the Church of Rome agrees in this teaching with the belief of the East; the old Itala and Syriac versions harmonize with the chorus of the Eastern and Western Churches; finally, Irenæus, the disciple of Polycarp, represents the belief of the Church of Lyons and of the Churches of Asia Minor as to the Johannine origin of the Fourth Gospel. Hence the Eastern and Western Churches agree in this belief in the last quarter of the second century. Nor can it be maintained that this agreement sprang into life only at that time. The Fourth Gospel was fairly well known throughout the course of the second century, as may be inferred from the writings of Justin Martyr, Ignatius, Papias, Polycarp, and of the heretics Basilides, Valentinus, and their followers. Seeing that this evidence leads us back practically to the time of John the Apostle, it can hardly be maintained that the general belief of the Church in the Johannine origin of the Fourth Gospel should have been confined to the end of the second century.

Harnack, Holtzmann, Jülicher, and Loisy are well acquainted with the historical argument outlined in the last paragraph. Harnack endeavors to destroy its force by a strict analysis; Holtzmann tries to upset it by synthetic speculation; Jülicher is more of an eclectic in his writings; Loisy outdoes even the Protestant critics in his extravagant views. In a paper like this we can hardly be expected to give in full the arguments and conclusions of the foregoing writers; it may be stated in general that their efforts have served admirably to point out the weak and more obscure points in the historical argument for the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel. But in spite of all difficulties urged by the foremost men of the century against the value of this argument, the Biblical Commission has formally proclaimed that its conclusiveness remains intact.

Moreover, the recent decree insists on the value of the argument drawn from internal evidence for the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel. "Doubt II. Whether also the internal reasons which are drawn from the text of the Fourth Gospel considered separately from the testimony of the writer and the manifest kinship of the same Gospel with the First Epistle of the Apostle John, must be considered to confirm the tradition which unhesitatingly attributes the Fourth Gospel to the same Apostle? And whether the difficulties which are drawn from the comparison of the same Gospel with the other three, having regard to the diversity of time, of scope, and of the hearers for whom or against whom the author wrote, can be reasonably solved, as the Holy Fathers and Catholic commentators have done at all times? Answer. Affirmatively to both parts."

Two points are here insisted on: first, the value of the argument for the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel drawn from internal evidence; secondly, the harmony between the contents of the Gospel of John and the teaching of the first three Gospels. The internal evidence referred to is partly direct, partly indirect. The former is based on the passages 1:14; 19:35; and especially 21:24, while the latter infers from the Fourth Gospel itself that its author was a Jew, a Palestinian Jew, an eye-witness, an Apostle, and finally John the Apostle. It is true that the argument is not apodictic, if it be taken by itself; but if taken together with the argument drawn from external evidence, it becomes fairly conclusive. Even taken alone, the various statements entering into the argument from internal evidence are much more weighty than the superficial exceptions urged by Jülicher, e. g. against the harmony between the Fourth Evangelist and the first three.

The mere denial of the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel may be an historical error; it may be a sin against the conclusiveness of solid historical arguments, but it does not directly affect the veracity of the Fourth Gospel in its historical and doctrinal statements. If the contents of the Gospel be infallibly true, if they be guaranteed by the inspiration of its

author, its doctrine concerning the sacred person of Christ remains the same whether it be written by John the Apostle or by John the Presbyter. But this does not fit in with the principles of the critics. Hence, whatever may be thought of the authorship of the Fourth Gospel, its historical character must be denied. They do not agree, however, as to the way in which the literal truthfulness of the Book is explained away. There are some who do not hesitate to charge the Evangelist with conscious fiction; a second class has recourse to doctrinal evolution; others again speak of a kind of literary extension.

Perhaps Baur, Loisy, Harnack, and Jülicher, may be taken as fair representatives of the first class. According to Loisy, e. g. the fourth Evangelist is a stranger to any historical preoccupation; he does not feel the slightest scruple in adapting the tradition to his doctrine; though there may not be fraud on his part in the proper sense of the word, there is certainly a lack of sincerity. Should we not call this manner of writing imposture rather than lack of sincerity? Again, the Evangelist idealized history; he rendered the Gospel universal by making Jesus the Saviour of the entire world, though these ideas were foreign to Jesus. Moreover, the discourses and miracles in the Fourth Gospel are surrounded with a pronounced allegorism. The terms resurrection, life, light, darkness, etc., have a meaning different from that attributed to these words in the synoptic Gospels, so that the authentic teaching of Jesus has been subjected to a process of interpretation and has suffered a real transformation. The problem of the Fourth Gospel consists only in ascertaining the character and degree of this change. As to Harnack and Jülicher, it is true that they do not employ the words fiction and imposture; but they find a "supreme liberty" in the Fourth Gospel, which frames and disposes events in a light different from the reality, and which would destroy our confidence in the tradition concerning Jesus, if it did not leave some traces of the truth.

Thus far we have considered the way in which some of the critics destroy the historical character of the Fourth Gospel by a method of conscious fiction. Holtzmann accom-

plishes the same end by the application of his system of doctrinal evolution. It follows the simple principle of demand and supply. The synoptists edified the first Christian neophytes by an allegorical or arbitrary interpretation of the Old Testament, applying its pretended prophecies to the person of Jesus Christ; but in order to meet the new needs of the converts from paganism the fourth Evangelist necessarily wrote a much more subjective gospel than the synoptists. A change may be observed both in the account of the miracles and the statement of the doctrine. Events and triumphs of later occurrence were projected back into the life of Jesus; similarly, the discourses of Jesus recorded in the Fourth Gospel as addressed to the Doctors of the Synagogue are a backward projection of the controversies occurring between the Jews and Christians at the beginning of the second century. In a word, according to Holtzmann the whole of the Fourth Gospel is a series of events and teachings carried back into the life of Jesus Christ from a much later period of time. We may add that Pfleiderer hardly differs substantially from the principles of Holtzmann.

A third class of writers destroys the historical character of the Fourth Gospel by what may be called the principle of extension. By way of illustrating this class we may call to mind the views expressed by Bernard Weiss. There can be no question of a literal reproduction of our Lord's discourses in the Fourth Gospel. Since the author wrote a considerable period of time after the actual occurrence of the events, a large portion of the contents of the Fourth Gospel represents the speculation of the Evangelist. The latter reproduced the discourses together with his own explanations. As the spiritual life of St. John had developed under the influence of the Master, he was secured against adding to his portrait of Jesus any feature foreign to the Master. Hence he did not scruple to put in the mouth of Jesus discourses not pronounced by him. Fr. Calmes does not differ very much from the foregoing views. John takes for his basis the doctrine taught by Jesus; he then forms his own theological theories on points of dogma. Thus Jn. III. expresses the Evangel-

ist's views on baptism; Jn. VI., those on the bread of life; Jn. VIII., those on justification. The Samaritan woman represents the ten schismatic tribes; her five husbands typify the foreign nations transported by the Assyrians into Samaria; the resuscitation of Lazarus signifies our resurrection to grace and glory.

What is the verdict of the Biblical Commission on the foregoing theories? "Doubt III. Whether notwithstanding the practice which has constantly obtained in the whole Church from the first ages, of arguing from the Fourth Gospel as from a strictly historical document, and considering moreover the peculiar character of the same Gospel and the author's manifest intention of illustrating and vindicating the Divinity of Christ from the very deeds and words of our Lord, it can be said that the facts narrated in the Fourth Gospel are wholly or in part made up to be allegories or doctrinal symbols, and that discourses of our Lord are not properly and truly the discourses of our Lord Himself, but the theological compositions of the writer, albeit they are placed in the mouth of our Lord? Answer. Negatively."

With this decision of the Biblical Commission agrees the condemnation of the following three theses contained in the so-called *New Syllabus: 16.* "The narrations of John are not properly history, but the mystical contemplation of the Gospel; the discourses contained in his Gospel are theological meditations, devoid of historical truth concerning the mystery of salvation." —*17.* "The Fourth Gospel exaggerated miracles not only that the wonderful might stand out, but also that they might become more suitable for signifying the work and the glory of the Word Incarnate." —*18.* "John claims for himself the quality of a witness concerning Christ; but in reality he is only a distinguished witness of the Christian life, or of the life of Christ in the Church, at the close of the first century."

We can hardly expect that the voice of Rome will have any direct influence on the critics outside the Church; but we are glad that Rome has spoken, for the sake of the many little ones of the flock, many of whom began to listen to the novelties of the critics rather than to the teaching of Christian tradition.

Criticisms and Notes.

THE THIRTEENTH—GREATEST OF CENTURIES. By James J. Walsh, M.D., Ph.D., LL.D., Prof. Medic. Fordham University, etc. With illustrations. Catholic Summer School Press: New York. 1907. Pp. 436.

Aside from the author's reputation as an expert in medical science and history, attested by his literary work in these special fields, he leaves upon his readers the impression of singular versatility, a gift which prompts him to illustrate his principles and deductions by the logic of demonstrated facts, in every branch of general and personal experience. This quality of his genius is brought out in strong relief by the present work, wherein we find the story of the Thirteenth Century told in so elegant and convincing a style that we bend our heads to shield the eyes from the abundance of clear and beautiful light, and at the same time ask ourselves: Is this the age which the historians have called "Dark"?

Dr. Walsh begins his account of the progress of nations during the Middle Ages by tracing the educational forces which had been active in transforming races which, before receiving the light of faith, had known only the art of war in its rudest form. Religion, dawning upon them from the south, brought with it all the light and genial warmth which awakened and nourished the germ-life of every noble enterprise in science, art, and letters; of liberty, domestic contentment, and true industrial progress such as was equally far removed from the excesses of monopolistic tyranny as from anarchical resistance. The beginnings of democracy, as offering an untainted charter of mutual rights, are simultaneous with the founding of the great universities as channels of all that was best in the domain of human knowledge and religious truth. The author leads his readers through these great institutions, points out the plan and method of their work, the wonderful results they achieved, with the *esprit de corps* that ennobled the individual by merging his activity in the greater good of the community.

If we closely examine the products of the genius of the thirteenth century and compare them with those of the twentieth, we

find our own age immeasurably behind that of the great poets, artists, scholars, explorers, and statesmen, whose monumental works have remained the chief sources of imitation as of admiration, down to the present. The minnesingers and troubadours, the men who wrote the *Dies Irae* and the *Stabat Mater*, the humorists who sketched such masterpieces as *Reynard the Fox*, writers like the author of the *Romance of the Rose*, or of the *Summa*, poets like Dante, women at once intellectually great and lovingly humane, such as Blanche of Castile, Isabella, Countess of Arundell, and the noted women teachers at the great universities, beneficent rulers like Louis IX and Innocent III—such are rarely found in our day, despite the increased facilities for study and management which the evolution of intellectual and physical energies has placed at our command.

We cannot here follow Dr. Walsh in the details of the beautiful, nor on that account less truthful, and instructive, picture which he draws of the life and manners, and of the achievements of what may be eminently styled the "Age of Faith." It is all the more necessary for Catholics to be in possession of the facts regarding this period of European history, because it is so commonly misrepresented, and because religious bigotry has succeeded in leaving the impression that causes the very noblest and brightest era of Christian civilization to be stigmatized as brutal and dark. To answer the vulgar plea of Protestants or infidels about the Church in the so-called Dark Ages we need but point to the facts of that period. Dr. Walsh gives us these facts in their most convincing form.

DISSERTATIO DE SANCTITATE MATRIMONII VINDICATA contra Onanismum, quam Ill. et Rmus. D. Fr. Maurus B. Nardi, O.F.C. concinnavit. Editio tertia. Romae: Desclée, Lefebvre et Soc. Pp. 377.

We are not partial to the discussion of works of this kind, even though we fully recognize the benefit which their study may afford to confessors and directors of consciences, or to those who prepare themselves for such tasks. If we pastors teach our children their Catechism, instruct their parents in fundamental religion, and offer them whole-souled priestly service, there will be no need of books on the necessity of avoiding onanism. However, those for whom pastoral administration means perfunctory

service of Mass, Sunday sermon, collection, vicarious school teaching, and spasmodic catechetical instruction, together with a business-like attendance on the sick, to such, I venture to think, a book that appeals to the utilitarian sense may serve as a warning and a help to lessen mischief and sin, which, if it grows among our own flocks, does so because the shepherds have been asleep and have allowed the wolf or the infected to enter the fold.

But taking for granted that the evil is widespread, and that many of our overseers feel themselves to be powerless, for one reason or another, to urge their pastoral watch-dogs to vigilance and activity, not merely by words, but by open-eyed visitation and the fearless application of the staff, we must thank Mgr. Nardi for giving both a general alarm of the existence of an evil, and very satisfactory directions how a confessor or spiritual monitor may diminish its virulence and the demoralizing and destructive effects which follow its practice.

Viewed from this point—which is of more especial interest to the political economist, the physician, the lover of mankind in general, and the pastor or guardian of the family—we have here an admirably complete treatise, dealing with the nature, causes, effects, and the remedies of onanism. The author shows the criminal character of the practice, its sad results upon family life and society. He points out that evil arises not merely from inherited or acquired viciousness, but is often closely allied to defective economic conditions. In this connexion the author treats of Malthusianism, pauperism, and the alternative tendency to easy and luxurious habits of living. In suggesting the remedies he naturally reverts to the order, sobriety, and sense of responsibility engendered by a faithful exercise of religious principles. He enlarges upon the benefits of temperance and celibacy, and answers the objections of those who believe that these institutions open the way to unnatural excesses.

In a second part of the volume the author confines himself to the discussion of the confessor's duty and the means toward combating the evil in his penitents, considering the various classes to whom the practice offers itself as a temptation. The author takes occasion to supplement the discussion by an Appendix wherein he answers in detail certain questions which had presented themselves after the completion of the work. The whole treatise is conceived in the clear argumentative style which is likely to commend itself to the scholastic student, no less than to confessors.

THEOLOGIA MORALIS Sancti Alphonsi Mariae de Ligorio, Doctoris Ecclesiae. Editio nova cum antiquis editionibus diligenter collata in singulis auctorum allegationibus recognita, cura et studio P. Leonardi Gaudé e Congr. SS. Redemptoris. Tomus Secundus—complectens Tractatus de septimo et octavo decalogi praeceptis, de praeceptis ecclesiae, de statibus particularibus, de actibus humanis et de peccatis. Romae: Ex Typographia Vaticana. MDCCCCVII. Pp. 785.

We have already expressed our appreciation of P. Leonard Gaudé's admirable work in procuring a thoroughly revised and reliable edition of the "Opus Morale Magnum" of St. Alphonsus. What we have said in regard to the careful editing, the value and arrangement of the notes, the marginal references, and the typographical excellence of the first volume, applies in equal measure to the second tome, opening with the important tract *De Furto*, in which the preamble *De Justitia et Jure, de Restitutione, de Contractibus, de Usura, de Tutela et Testamentis*, are discussed in connexion with the seventh precept of the Decalogue. The last three Commandments and the precepts of the Church follow in one single tract, after which the *Praecepta Particularia certo hominum statui propria* are taken in the order with which the students of theology are familiar. The remaining part of the volume discusses the *Ratio cognoscendi et discernendi peccata*, which introduces the student into the special field of the confessor's duty.

Literary Chat.

A correspondent, J. F. S., writes to us: "The majority of magazines will not accept MSS. unless they are typewritten. In Scriptural references, how will we distinguish chapter and verse on the typewriter? Formerly Roman numerals indicated the chapters and Arabic figures the verses, but now nearly every one uses figures for both. In some publications heavy type is used for the chapters and light-faced type for the verses; in others, large figures indicate the chapters and small figures above the line the verses. But we have only one set of figures on the typewriter; how then shall we most clearly distinguish chapter and verse?

"If we underline all the verse figures, and hand our paper to a typewriter, we will have no further trouble. The typewriter will underline them too, and the editor of the publication to which they are sent may put the underlined figures in lighter type, in smaller type, or in italics,

whichever he chooses; in any case the distinction between chapter and verse will be so clear that there will be no danger of confounding them. The separation of chapter and verse by a colon (:) is not the simplest and best distinction. The advantages of italics over the colon will be shown in the following summary of the contents of the Gospel of St. Luke:

"The Preface.....	1 *1—4*	1 : 1—4
Gospel of the Infancy.....	1 *5*—2	1 : 5—2 : 52
Ministry in Galilee.....	3—9 *50*	3 : 1—9 : 50
Ministry outside Galilee.....	9 *51*—19 *28*	9 : 51—19 : 28
Last days of public teaching.....	19 *29*—21	19 : 29—21 : 38
The Passion and Resurrection.....	22—24	22 : 1—24 : 53

"In the first column italics indicate the verses, in the second the colon. In the second column eleven colons and eight extra figures are used, which are unnecessary."

The true significance of the recent utterance of Pius X, in condemnation of the false pretensions of modern science, is perhaps best shown by the almost simultaneous organization in Rome, under the patronage of the Holy See, of the "Associazione Internazionale per il progresso della Scienza fra i Cattolici," the preliminary program of which is published in the *Osservatore Romano*, under date of 15 August. The Promoters' Committee includes eminent lawyers, physicians, publicists, from all parts of Italy, representing the various branches of exact and applied science taught at the great universities. Among the clergy we note the director of the *Revista di Scienze Storiche* (Pavia), Mgr. Maiocchi, and the two Jesuit Fathers Haagen and Stein, who direct the Vatican astronomical observatory.

The object of the Society is not merely to promote research, but to foster scientific propaganda by equipping laboratories and museums, press facilities, and library conveniences, and most of all by establishing scientific scholarships so as to afford students of ability an opportunity to pursue original investigation, and to propagate scientific knowledge, through a liberal distribution of books, pamphlets, and journals. The plan as outlined is quite elaborate, and provides for five distinct departments of scientific activity—theology, including Biblical studies and ethics, as well as the special branches comprised under these disciplines; next jurisprudence, social, economical, political science; the third group comprises physics, mathematics, and the allied sciences; history, statistics, geography; finally, philology and literature (belleletristic). The necessary steps for securing the interest of non-Italian scientists are being taken by the Promoters' Committee.

The poet Gerald Massey, who has for many years occupied himself with the topic of origins of religion, is about to publish (Fisher Unwin) a vol-

ume, entitled *Ancient Egypt the Light of the World*, in which the author gives it as his demonstrated conviction that Judaism and Christianity have borrowed their fundamental doctrines and rites from Egyptian cults. We are inclined to ask: Whence did Egypt borrow her doctrines and rites? Surely, God revealed Himself to the patriarchs of old, and we may assume that Egypt came to its inheritance in the natural way. There is a common source, undoubtedly, to the primary truths of revelation and to the fundamental practices of religious worship; but what we claim for the Jewish and Christian Churches as such are the distinctive features of a perfected and consistently progressive revelation, embodying the old, or rather building upon the old what was unknown and only indefinitely felt, in the primitive Messianic longings. This the Old Testament expresses, and the New Law reveals, in a completeness which no one can presume to affirm of the Egyptian religion.

Periodical theological literature loses in the recent death of Mgr. Felix Cadène one of its ablest and most energetic exponents. The *Analecta Ecclesiastica* (*Romana Collectanea*) which he founded and edited for nearly fifteen years was the one monthly ecclesiastical publication which, issued in Rome, during all these years was never dilatory, always reliable, maintaining its original purpose and its dignity in form and tone. He was a Frenchman by birth and by sympathies, and his periodical, though it never acquired official recognition—the *Acta Sanctae Sedis* being much older and in possession as accepted official organ of the S. Congregations—did its work in so prompt and satisfactory a way that there was none other equal to it in the secular ecclesiastical press of Italy. The magazine is to be continued by one of the priests of the S. Luigi dei Francesi, who pays a well-merited tribute to the dead prelate in the July issue.

The following beautiful quatrain inscribed "To W. A. R., S.J." is sent to us by R. W. Dace:

A newer fragrance in God's holy place,
A spirit poured as spikenard on the sod:
And thou—the broken alabaster vase,
The white shards lying by the Feet of God.

Professor Harnack's book on St. Luke has been translated into English under the caption "Luke, the Physician" (Putnams). The German critic admits the authenticity and authorship of the Third Gospel and of the Acts of the Apostles. This is an important concession, coming, as it does, from the chief representative of modern so-called higher criticism. The Tübingen rationalists were quite sure that the Lucan authorship was pure fiction, and Baur would hardly rejoice at the Berlin professor's ultimatum, though the latter is by no means an ardent disciple of the school which has no fault to find with the composition of the friend and companion of St. Paul, his "beloved physician."

The second volume of the *History of the Diocese of Sault Ste. Marie and Marquette*, by the Rev. Antoine Ivan Rezek, is, like its forerunner, the first, a fine piece of work in respect of both contents and form. It deals with the inner life of the dioceses and missions comprised in the original territory indicated in its name. Churches and schools, their builders and preservers, offer instructive and often delightful reading, with the requisite basis of history and statistics which make the work of permanent value to the writers and readers of American church history.

A new history of *Dante and his Italy*, by Lonesdale Ragg, chaplain of the English colony at Venice, differs in some important respects from the recent popular biographies and introductions to the study of the Florentine poet. The author not only records the trustworthy chronicles of Dante's time, but he interprets them, as well as the poet's own prepossessions, in the light of a judicious criticism that balances the active causes of human weakness in the world with the idealizing tendency of a generation whose history presents the most puzzling contrasts on its surface. There are dark spots in the picture which Dante himself has drawn of ecclesiastical life; our author does not ignore them, but in some cases shows them to be due to optical illusions of the sensitive poet and his intimate sympathizers. The book is not a critical work, and hence is open to some questioning as to accuracy of statements in detail, such as that touching the Bologna sojourn, or the authenticity of the Giotto portrait of the poet; but there is much that is new and wholesome for the student of thirteenth-century life.

The Pustets have issued a new edition (third) of volumes II and III of Dr. Schanz's *Christian Apology*, translated by Fathers Clancey and Schobel. The work was first published in 1891 and has answered a continuous demand on the part of students in theology and of educated laymen. It is a book which we would specially recommend to teachers who are under the necessity of broadening their views on the subject of science in its relation to practical religion.

Father Reginald Buckler's *A Spiritual Retreat* (Benziger Bros.) commends itself for its practical presentation of the cardinal truths and relations of religious life; yet his method is not at all of that practical sort, somewhat popular at the present day among preachers of retreats, which assumes that the commonplace is the only level upon which truth can be made intelligible, and that the sensational address is the only language which stirs the heart of modern people. This is a fallacy. Earnestness, reverence, simplicity are the three colors that convey the brightness of the white light of truth, and Father Buckler uses them in his reflections.

Books Received.

BIBLICAL.

THE PSALTER, or Book of Psalms in Latin and English (Douay Version). New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1907. Pp. 520. Price, $0 85.

L'ORIGINE DU QUATRIÈME EVANGILE. Par M. Lepin, Prof. du Grand Seminaire du Lyons. Deuxième édition. Paris: Letouzey et Ané. 1907. Pp. 508.

CONFERENCES FOR CHILDREN ON THE GOSPEL OF SAINT JOHN. By Sister Mary Teresa, O. S. B. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1907. Pp. 120. Price, $0.85.

THEOLOGICAL AND DEVOTIONAL.

TRACTATUS DE DEO UNO ET TRINO quem in usum auditorum suorum concinnavit G. Van Noort, S. Theol. in Seminario Warmundano professor. Amsterdami: C. L. Van Langenhuysen; London: Burns & Oates, Ltd. 1907. Pp. 219. Price, 3 *s.*

KIRCHLICHES HANDLEXIKON. Ein Nachschlagebuch über das Gesammtgebiet der Theologie und ihrer Hilftswissenschaften. Unter Mitwirkung zahlreicher Fachgelehrten, Prof. Hilgenreiner, Jos. B. Nisius, S. J., und Joseph Schlect. Herausgegeben von Prof. Mich. Buchberger. I Bd. A-H. München: Allgemeine Verlagsgesellschaft; St. Louis: B. Herder. 1907. Price, $7.00.

PRACTICAL SERMONS for all the Sundays and Holidays of the Year. On the plan of the "Full Course of Instructions." By the Rev. John Perry. Two volumes. Pp. 509. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1907. Price, $2.50.

STEPPING-STONES TO HEAVEN. A Daily Memento of the Saints and Thomas à Kempis. Compiled by Evelyn L. Raymond Barker. With Preface by Monsignor Canon Johnston, D. D. London: R. & T. Washbourne; New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1907. Pp. 366. Price, $0.60.

SELECTED POETRY OF FATHER FABER. By the Rev. John Fitzpatrick, O. M. I. London: R. & T. Washbourne; New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros. 1907. Pp. 203. Price, $0.90.

HOME FOR GOOD. By Mother Mary Loyola. Edited by Father Thurston, S. J. New York City: P. J. Kenedy & Sons. 1907. Pp. 323. Price, $1.25.

LITURGICAL AND MUSICAL.

VADE MECUM FOR VOCAL CULTURE. A Complete Course of Instruction in Singing and the Rudiments of Music. By the Rev. Michael Haller. Translated by the Rev. B. Dieringer, St. Francis, Wis. Ratisbon, Rome, New York and Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet & Co. 1907. Pp. 259. Price, $1.00

KYRIALE SEU ORDINARIUM MISSAE juxta editionem Vaticanam a SS. PP. Pio X evulgatam. Cum approbatione Sacr. Rituum Congregationis et Ordinariatus Ratisbonensis. Ratisbonae, Romae, Neo Eboraci et Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet et Soc. 1907. Pp. 64. Price, $5.00.

THE ROMAN VESPERAL according to the Vesperale Romanum for the Entire Ecclesiastical Year. For the use of Catholic Choirs and School Children. By the Rev. John B. Jung. With the Approbation of the Right Rev. R. Gilmour, Bishop of Cleveland, Ohio. Fifth Edition. Ratisbon, Rome, New York and Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet & Co. Pp. vi—208. Price, $0.75 *net.*